arXiv:1603.06378v1 [math.PR] 21 Mar 2016

Conditional Monte Carlo: A Change-of-Variables Approach

Guiyun Feng
Department of Industrial & Systems Engineering, University of Minnesota
111 Church Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA

Guangwu Liu
Department of Management Sciences, City University of Hong Kong
Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong

March 22, 2016

Abstract

Conditional Monte Carlo (CMC) has been widely used for sensitivity estimation with discontinuous integrands as a standard simulation technique. A major limitation of using CMC in this context is that finding conditioning variables to ensure continuity and tractability of the resulting conditional expectation is often problem dependent and may be difficult. In this paper, we attempt to circumvent this difficulty by proposing a change-of-variables approach to CMC, leading to efficient sensitivity estimators under mild conditions that are satisfied by a wide class of discontinuous integrands. These estimators do not rely on the structure of the simulation models and are less problem dependent. The value of the proposed approach is exemplified through applications in sensitivity estimation for financial options and gradient estimation of chance-constrained optimization problems.

1 Introduction

Conditional Monte Carlo (CMC) is a standard simulation technique that has been widely discussed by many simulation textbooks; see, e.g., Law and Kelton (2000) and Asmussen and Glynn (2007). When estimating the expectation of a random performance, the basic idea of CMC is to use conditional expectation of the performance, rather than the random performance itself, as an estimator, where appropriate conditioning variables are chosen to obtain the conditional expectation. It is well known that the CMC estimator has a smaller variance, as guaranteed by the law of total variance.

In this paper, our main interest is focused on the use of CMC in sensitivity estimation of an expectation, another context in which CMC plays an important role. In particular, we consider a setting that the integrand of the expectation is discontinuous, under which sensitivity estimation is challenging, and has received a significant amount of attention in the simulation community in recent years. In this setting, CMC works in conjunction with infinitesimal perturbation analysis (IPA, also known as the pathwise method) that suggests interchanging the order of differentiation and expectation. Typically, IPA does not work when the integrand is discontinuous, because

the interchange is not valid due to discontinuity. To fix this issue, CMC suggests finding appropriate conditioning variables and then applying IPA on the conditional expectation that is often continuous. The intuition behind is that taking conditional expectation can often "integrate out" discontinuity and smooth the integrand. This idea was first proposed by Gong and Ho (1987) and Suri and Zazanis (1988), and is also referred to as smoothed perturbation analysis; see Fu and Hu (1997) for a monograph on detailed treatments, and Wang at al. (2009) and Fu et al. (2009) for some of its recent applications.

A major limitation of CMC for sensitivity estimation is how to find conditioning variables such that the conditional expectation is smooth and easily computable. Finding such conditioning variables is problem dependent and could be difficult for some cases. For instance, when discontinuity comes from an indicator function that equals 1 if the maximum of a random vector is smaller than a threshold and 0 otherwise, it may be difficult to find conditioning variables to ensure continuity of the resulting conditional expectation. This limitation motivates us to reexamine CMC from other perspectives, aiming to circumvent the difficulty on finding conditioning variables.

In this paper, we study CMC from a change-of-variables perspective, and we call it *a change-of-variables approach*. Intuitively, it proceeds by constructing a one-to-one mapping and applying a change of variables, followed by taking iterated integrations. The approach is appealing when the discontinuous integrand involves an indicator function. In this setting, we want to estimate the sensitivities of the expectation of

$$l(\mathbf{X}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}) \leq \xi\}}, \tag{1}$$

for continuous functions $l(\cdot)$ and $h(\cdot)$, where $\mathbf{X}$ is a random vector that captures the randomness of the simulation, and ξ is a given constant. A one-to-one mapping $\mathbf{X} \mapsto (u(\mathbf{X}), h(\mathbf{X}))$ can be constructed with a vector function u, and a change-of-variables formula represents the expectation of (1) as a double integral taken over the supports of $u(\mathbf{X})$ and $h(\mathbf{X})$, respectively. Then integrating along the dimension of $h(\mathbf{X})$ over $(-\infty, \xi)$ removes the indicator and produces a smooth integrand, which enables the use of IPA for sensitivity estimation.

Though the intuition of the change-of-variables approach is straightforward, its theoretical justification under a general setting is not trivial, because the domain and image sets of the mapping may have different Euclidean dimensions. For instance, when $\mathbf{X} \triangleq (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$ and $h(\mathbf{X}) = \max(X_1, \ldots, X_m)$, a useful one-to-one mapping that we may construct is $\mathbf{X} \mapsto (\mathbf{X}/h(\mathbf{X}), h(\mathbf{X}))$. While the domain of this mapping is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$, its image is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, which is indeed an m-dimensional manifold in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Change-of-variables formulas for such cases involve an extension of Lebesgue measure, and more generally, geometric measure theory; see Federer (1996) for a monograph. In this paper, we provide theoretical underpinnings of the approach under a general setting, and discuss how it can be applied to develop sensitivity estimators.

Sensitivity estimation finds applications in a wide range of areas in operations research. For

instance, it can be used in simulation optimization to estimate gradients that serve as key inputs to many gradient-based optimization algorithms. In financial applications, it estimates hedging parameters such as delta and gamma, which play important roles in risk management of financial securities. There has been a vast literature on sensitivity estimation, and various methods have been proposed, traditional ones including finite-difference approximations, IPA (see, e.g., Ho and Cao 1983 and Broadie and Glasserman 1996), the likelihood ratio method (see, e.g., Glynn 1987 and L'Ecuyer 1990), the weak derivative method (see, e.g., Pflug 1988 and Pflug and Weisshaupt 2005), and the Malliavin calculus method (see, e.g., Bernis et al. 2003 and Chen and Glasserman 2007). In recent years, sensitivity estimation for expectations with discontinuous integrands has received a significant amount of attention among simulation researchers and several methods have been proposed. Lyuu and Teng (2011) showed that the sensitivity can be written as an integral taken over an appropriate subset, and suggested using importance sampling to estimate the integral. Liu and Hong (2011) showed that the sensitivity is a summation of two terms with the latter one involving a conditional expectation and a density, and proposed a kernel smoothing method to estimate the second term. Wang et al. (2012) proposed the so-called SLRIPA method that moves the parameter of interest out of the indicator function to smooth the integrand and enables the use of IPA. It unifies the likelihood ratio method and the IPA method in certain sense. Chan and Joshi (2013) suggested a novel bumping on sample paths in a way that discontinuous points are eliminated. Essentially their approach relies on an appropriate change of variables on the sample paths. Along the line of Liu and Hong (2011), Tong and Liu (2016) proposed an importance sampling method to estimate conditional expectations, leading to unbiased estimators of the sensitivities.

As a remark, we would like to point out that the change-of-variables idea is not new for Monte Carlo simulation. Dating back to 1950s, a change-of-variables argument was discussed by Hammersley (1956) in the context of computing a conditional expectation at a fixed point, and further elaborated by Wendel (1957) from a group-theoretic aspect. This line of research, however, received little attention afterwards and its theoretical underpinnings were underdeveloped.

To summarize, we make the following contributions in this paper.

- We develop a change-of-variables framework of CMC for general integrands and provide theoretical underpinnings. This framework is adapted to Hausdorff measure that offers great flexibility in construction of CMC estimators.

- We propose sensitivity estimators for expectations with discontinuous integrands of the form (1). These estimators require only the probability density function of $\mathbf{X}$ as an input and certain smoothness conditions on the function h. They are less problem dependent, and work for a wide class of h's.

- We study two applications, including sensitivity estimation for financial options with dis-

continuous payoffs and gradient estimation of chance-constrained optimization problems, to illustrate how the proposed approach may lead to new and efficient estimators.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We formulate the problem in Section 2, and introduce the main idea of the change-of-variables approach in Section 3. Section 4 shows how to use the change-of-variables approach for sensitivity estimation with discontinuous integrands. Two applications with numerical examples are considered in Section 5 to exemplify the value of the proposed approach, followed by concluding remarks in Section 6. Proofs of the main results are provided in the appendix, while lengthy details of the estimators used in numerical examples are put in an online supplement.

Notation. Throughout the paper, we let boldface and italic letters denote vectors and vector elements respectively, and upper-case letters denote random counterparts of the lower-case ones. For a mapping u, $u\{A\}$ denotes the set of images of a set A in the domain, while $u(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the image of an element $\mathbf{x} \in A$.

2 Problem Formulation

Consider a sensitivity estimation problem for an expectation with a discontinuous integrand of the form

$$l(\mathbf{X}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}) \leq \xi\}},$$

where l and h are continuous functions, ξ is a given constant, and $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$ is a random vector that captures the randomness of the simulation. This form of integrands has received a significant amount of attention in the simulation society in recent years; see, e.g., Lyuu and Teng (2011), Hong and Liu (2011), Wang et al. (2012), Chan and Joshi (2013), and Tong and Liu (2016).

Throughout the paper, we assume that $\mathbf{X}$ has a known density function.

Assumption 1. *The random vector* $\mathbf{X}$ *has a density function* $f(\mathbf{x})$ *on a support* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$.

This assumption can be further relaxed to a requirement of a conditional density of $\mathbf{X}$ given a random vector $\mathbf{G}$; see Section B.1.2 of the online supplement for such an example.

Suppose the sensitivity of interest is taken with respect to (w.r.t.) θ, a parameter on which $\mathbf{X}$ may depend. Without loss of generality we assume that θ is one-dimensional and $\theta \in \Theta$, where Θ is an open set. If θ is multidimensional, one may treat each dimension as a one-dimensional parameter while fixing other dimensions as constants.

Explicitly accounting for its dependence on θ, the quantity we want to estimate is written as

$$\gamma'(\theta) \triangleq \frac{d}{d\theta} \mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X}(\theta)) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}(\theta)) \leq \xi\}} \right]. \tag{2}$$

One of the methods for estimating $\gamma'(\theta)$ is to explore the possibility of interchanging the order of differentiation and expectation, which is, unfortunately, invalid for the discontinuous integrand in (2). As a remedy, CMC suggests choosing conditioning variables $\mathbf{Y}$, leading to

$$\gamma'(\theta) = \frac{d}{d\theta}\mathrm{E}\left[w(\mathbf{Y};\theta)\right], \tag{3}$$

where

$$w(\mathbf{Y};\theta) \triangleq \mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X}(\theta)) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}(\theta))\leq\xi\}} \middle| \mathbf{Y}\right].$$

It is then expected that the interchange of differentiation and expectation on (3) may be valid for appropriate $\mathbf{Y}$, and if so, $\gamma'(\theta)$ can be estimated by a sample mean of $dw(\mathbf{Y};\theta)/d\theta$, provided that it is easily computable.

A major limitation of CMC is on how to find appropriate conditioning variables $\mathbf{Y}$. For some cases, finding $\mathbf{Y}$ to ensure both differentiability of $w(\mathbf{Y};\theta)$ and tractability of $dw(\mathbf{Y};\theta)/d\theta$ is difficult, e.g., when $h(\mathbf{X}) = \max(X_1, \ldots, X_m)$.

In this paper, we study CMC from a change-of-variables perspective, aiming to circumvent the difficulty on choosing $\mathbf{Y}$. Before we proceed further, we decompose the problem by converting the sensitivity w.r.t. any parameter θ to a sensitivity w.r.t. ξ. In particular, Liu and Hong (2011, Theorem 1) showed that under mild regularity conditions, $\gamma'(\theta)$ can be represented as

$$\gamma'(\theta) = \mathrm{E}\left[\partial_\theta l(\mathbf{X}(\theta)) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}(\theta))\leq\xi\}}\right] - \partial_\xi \mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X}(\theta))\partial_\theta h(\mathbf{X}(\theta)) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}(\theta))\leq\xi\}}\right], \tag{4}$$

where ∂ denotes the differentiation operator, and $\partial_\theta l(\mathbf{X}(\theta))$ and $\partial_\theta h(\mathbf{X}(\theta))$ are pathwise derivatives that are often readily computable from simulation.

The result in (4) shows that the sensitivity w.r.t. any θ can be related to the sensitivity w.r.t. ξ. Note that the first term on the right-hand-side can be straightforwardly estimated by a sample mean. The problem of estimating $\gamma'(\theta)$ is then reduced to how to estimate the second term.

Without loss of generality, the remainder of this paper is focused on the reduced problem in which we want to estimate

$$\alpha'(\xi) \triangleq \frac{d}{d\xi}\mathrm{E}\left[g(\mathbf{X}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X})\leq\xi\}}\right], \tag{5}$$

for some function g, where the dependence of $\mathbf{X}$ on θ is suppressed when there is no confusion.[1]

3 A Change-of-Variables Approach

This section introduces the main idea of the change-of-variables approach. Section 3.1 provides intuitions and motivating examples. Section 3.2 lays down the framework of the approach. Discussion of the approach in sensitivity estimation for integrands of the form (1) will be presented in a following section.

[1]There is no smoothness requirement on the function g which is allowed to be discontinuous.

The change-of-variables argument applies to a general integrand, beyond the form specified in (1). To avoid heavy notations, in this section we work with a general integrand $p(\mathbf{X})$, and discuss the change-of-variables approach for $\mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right]$.

3.1 Intuitions and Motivating Examples

Consider the expectation $\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})]$. Recall that CMC yields $\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \mathrm{E}\left[w(\mathbf{Y})\right]$, where $w(\mathbf{y}) = \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}\right]$. In terminology, we refer to CMC based on conditioning variables as *conventional CMC*.

We highlight the intuition of our approach by recovering the above conventional CMC estimator from a change-of-variables perspective, where we ignore mathematical rigor at this stage. The change-of-variables approach proceeds by constructing a one-to-one mapping

$$u : \mathbf{X} \mapsto (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z}).$$

Let $f(\mathbf{x})$ and $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ denote the density functions of $\mathbf{X}$ and $(\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{Z})$, respectively. Then,

$$\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \int p(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x})\, d\mathbf{x} = \int\int p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}))\tilde{f}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\, d\mathbf{z}\, d\mathbf{y}. \tag{6}$$

If we set

$$w(\mathbf{y}) = \int p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}))\tilde{f}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\, d\mathbf{z} \Big/ \int \tilde{f}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\, d\mathbf{z},$$

it can be easily verified that

$$\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \int w(\mathbf{y}) \int \tilde{f}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\, d\mathbf{z}\, d\mathbf{y} = \mathrm{E}\left[w(\mathbf{Y})\right], \tag{7}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $\int \tilde{f}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})\, d\mathbf{z}$ is the marginal density of $\mathbf{Y}$.

In short, the conventional CMC estimator can be recovered by a change-of-variables argument in (6) in conjunction with an application of Fubini's Theorem in (7). Compared to finding conditioning variables $\mathbf{Y}$, the change-of-variables perspective offers more flexibility in deriving CMC estimators. To see this, we consider two examples, where $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2)$ with X_1 and X_2 following independent exponential distributions with mean 1, and let F_e and f_e denote the c.d.f. and p.d.f. of the exponential distribution, respectively.

Example 1. $p(\mathbf{X}) = X_1 \cdot 1_{\{X_1 + X_2 \le \xi\}}$ for a given constant $\xi > 0$. Conventional CMC may suggest choosing X_1 as a conditioning variable. Then,

$$\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{E}\left[X_1 \cdot 1_{\{X_1 + X_2 \le \xi\}} | X_1\right]\right) = \mathrm{E}\left[X_1 F_e(\xi - X_1)\right].$$

This estimator can be recovered from a change-of-variables perspective using a one-to-one mapping: $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_1, x_1 + x_2) \triangleq (y_1, y_2)$. The Jacobian (the absolute value of the determinant of the

derivative matrix) of the mapping is 1, and the density of $(Y_1, Y_2) \triangleq (X_1, X_1 + X_2)$ is $f_e(y_1)f_e(y_2 - y_1)$. Then,

$$\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \int\int 1_{\{y_2 \le \xi\}} y_1 f_e(y_1) f_e(y_2 - y_1)\, dy_2\, dy_1 = \mathrm{E}\left[w(Y_1)\right],$$

where

$$w(y_1) = \frac{\int 1_{\{y_2 \le \xi\}} y_1 f_e(y_1) f_e(y_2 - y_1)\, dy_2}{\int f_e(y_1) f_e(y_2 - y_1)\, dy_2} = y_1 F_e(\xi - y_1).$$

Interestingly, it is also possible to construct a one-to-one mapping which leads to a new estimator that cannot be derived by conventional CMC. Consider the one-to-one mapping:

$$(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (y_1, y_2, z) \triangleq \left(\frac{x_1}{x_1 + x_2}, \frac{x_2}{x_1 + x_2}, x_1 + x_2\right).$$



Figure 1: Illustration of the mapping $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (y_1, y_2, z) \triangleq \left(\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2}, \frac{x_2}{x_1+x_2}, x_1 + x_2\right)$, where the left and right panels show the domain and image sets of the mapping, respectively.

As shown in Figure 1, image set of the mapping is $\{(y_1, y_2, z) : y_1 + y_2 = 1, y_1 > 0, y_2 > 0, z > 0\}$. It can be checked that the mapping is indeed one-to-one, and the Jacobian of the mapping is $\sqrt{2}/z$. Define $(Y_1, Y_2, Z) \triangleq \left(\frac{X_1}{X_1+X_2}, \frac{X_2}{X_1+X_2}, X_1 + X_2\right)$, then the density of (Y_1, Y_2, Z) is $\tilde{f}(y_1, y_2, z) = z f_e(y_1 z) f_e(y_2 z)/\sqrt{2}$, and

$$\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \int\int\int 1_{\{z \le \xi\}} y_1 z \tilde{f}(y_1, y_2, z)\, dz\, dy_1\, dy_2 = \mathrm{E}\left[w(Y_1, Y_2)\right], \tag{8}$$

where

$$w(y_1, y_2) = \frac{\int 1_{\{z \le \xi\}} y_1 z \tilde{f}(y_1, y_2, z)\, dz}{\int \tilde{f}(y_1, y_2, z)\, dz} = \frac{2y_1}{y_1 + y_2} - e^{-(y_1+y_2)\xi}\left(\frac{2y_1}{y_1 + y_2} - 2y_1\xi - y_1(y_1 + y_2)\xi\right). \tag{9}$$

Example 2. $p(\mathbf{X}) = X_1 \cdot 1_{\{\max(X_1, X_2) \le \xi\}}$. Conventional CMC may suggest conditioning on X_1, leading to

$$\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \mathrm{E}\left[F_e(\xi) X_1 1_{\{X_1 \le \xi\}}\right].$$

Similar to the argument in Example 1, this estimator follows from a change of variables with an identity mapping.

If we construct another one-to-one mapping:

$$(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (y_1, y_2, z) \triangleq \left(\frac{x_1}{\max(x_1, x_2)}, \frac{x_2}{\max(x_1, x_2)}, \max(x_1, x_2) \right).$$

Then by a similar argument as in Example 1,

$$\mathrm{E}[p(\mathbf{X})] = \mathrm{E}\left[w(Y_1, Y_2) \right],$$

where $(Y_1, Y_2) \triangleq \left(\frac{X_1}{\max(X_1, X_2)}, \frac{X_2}{\max(X_1, X_2)} \right)$, and $w(y_1, y_2)$ has exactly the same form as in (9).

These examples illustrate that a change-of-variables argument offers more flexibility for CMC and may lead to new estimators. However, it should be pointed out that the integral in (8) is not well defined in Lebesgue sense. Note that the integral in (8) is taken over a set $\{(y_1, y_2, z) | y_1 > 0, y_2 > 0, z > 0, y_1 + y_2 = 1\}$ which is a hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^3$. This set has Lebesgue measure 0 and the integral is thus not well defined in Lebesgue sense. Rigorous definition of integrals for such cases will be provided in Section 3.2.

3.2 A Change-of-Variables Framework of CMC

We lay down a mathematical framework of the change-of-variables approach for $\mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right]$. Consider a one-to-one mapping on Ω, the support of $\mathbf{X}$:

$$u \triangleq (u_1, \ldots, u_n) : \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where $n \geq m$, u_i's are functions of $\mathbf{x}$, and the image set of the mapping is denoted by $u\{\Omega\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The mapping is said to be differentiable at $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ if partial derivatives $Du(\mathbf{x})$ exist, and continuously differentiable if all partial derivatives are continuous, where the partial derivative matrix is defined as

$$Du(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial u_1(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_1 & \partial u_2(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_1 & \ldots & \partial u_n(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_1 \\ \partial u_1(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_2 & \partial u_2(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_2 & \ldots & \partial u_n(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \partial u_1(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_m & \partial u_2(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_m & \ldots & \partial u_n(\mathbf{x})/\partial x_m \end{pmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, for a subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^m$, u is said to be Lipschitz continuous if $|u(\mathbf{x}_1) - u(\mathbf{x}_2)| \leq c|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2|$ for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in E$, and a constant c.

It should be emphasized that for a general one-to-one mapping, n may not equal m. When $n > m$, the image set of the mapping is essentially an "m-dimensional" subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. For instance, the image set of the mapping illustrated in Figures 1 is indeed a hyperplane that is a 2-dimensional subsets of $\mathbb{R}^3$. For such cases, the integrals taken over the image sets are not well defined in Lebesgue sense. To deal with this issue, we work with Hausdorff measure, an extension of Lebesgue measure.

Definition 1 (Hausdorff Measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$)**.** *Let A be a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, and define its diameter by $diam(A) \triangleq \{|x-y| : x, y \in A\}$. For any $\delta \in (0, \infty]$ and $s \in [0, \infty)$, define $\mathcal{H}^s_\delta(A) = \inf\left\{\sum_{i=1}^\infty \omega(s)\left(\frac{diam(A_i)}{2}\right)^s ; A \subset \cup_{i=1}^\infty A_i, diam(A_i) \leq \delta\right\}$, where $\omega(s) = \pi^{s/2}/\Gamma(s/2+1)$, and $\Gamma(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-x}x^{t-1}\,dx$. Then s-dimensional Hausdorff measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as*

$$\mathcal{H}^s(A) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \mathcal{H}^s_\delta(A).$$

Furthermore, Hausdorff dimension of A is defined by $\dim_{\mathcal{H}}(A) = \inf\{s \in [0, \infty); \mathcal{H}^s(A) = 0\}$.

Essentially, Hausdorff measure generalizes the concepts of length, area, and volume. For instance, 1-dimensional Hausdorff measure of a smooth curve in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the length of the curve, and 2-dimensional Hausdorff measure of a smooth surface in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is its area. Hausdorff measure has several properties: $\mathcal{H}^s \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ for any $s > n$, $\mathcal{H}^s(\lambda A) = \lambda^s \mathcal{H}^s(A)$ for any $\lambda > 0$, and $\mathcal{H}^s$ is equivalent to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ when $s = n$. Hausdorff measure is a useful tool to measure "small" subsets in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For instance, a set $A = [0,1] \times [0,1] \times \{1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a "copy" of the 2-dimensional square $[0,1] \times [0,1]$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Its volume is 0, as its Lebesgue measure is 0. It has, however, an area of 1, i.e., $\mathcal{H}^2(A) = 1$, and its Hausdorff dimension is 2.

To characterize smoothness of a set on $\mathbb{R}^n$, we introduce the concept of rectifiability.

Definition 2 (Rectifiable Sets)**.** *For $m \leq n$, a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be $(\mathcal{H}^m, m)$ rectifiable if there exist a countable collection $\{v_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ of continuously differentiable mappings $v_i : \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathcal{H}^m\left(A \backslash \bigcup_{i=1}^\infty v_i\left(\mathbb{R}^m\right)\right) = 0$.*

Typically, a set is rectifiable if it can be represented as the union of images of continuously differentiable mappings. For instance, the set $A = [0,1] \times [0,1] \times \{1\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is $(\mathcal{H}^2, 2)$ rectifiable, because it is the image of a mapping $u : \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^3$ where $u(x_1, x_2) = (x_1, x_2, 1)$. Intuitively speaking, a rectifiable set is a piece-wise "smooth" set in $\mathbb{R}^n$. It has many of the desirable properties when taking Hausdorff integrals.

When applying changes of variables for the mapping $u : \mathbb{R}^m \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$, the Jacobian plays a critical role. When $n = m$, the Jacobian is defined as the absolute value of the determinant of Du, serving as a corrective factor that relates the "volumes" of the domain and image sets. In a more general setting where $n \geq m$, Du may not be a square matrix, and an extension of the Jacobian is defined as follows(see, e.g., Morgan (2009)).

Definition 3 (k-dimensional Jacobian)**.** *Let $J^u_k(\mathbf{x})$ denote the k-dimensional Jacobian of u at $\mathbf{x}$. Then $J^u_k(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ if rank$(Du(\mathbf{x})) < k$, and it is equal to square root of the sum of squares of the determinants of the $k \times k$ submatrices of $Du(\mathbf{x})$ if rank$(Du(\mathbf{x})) \geq k$.*

In what follows, we discuss how the change-of-variables approach works as in Examples 1 and 2. It proceeds by two steps. In the first step, we note that $m \leq n$, $u\{\Omega\}$ is essentially an m-dimensional

subset on $\mathbb{R}^n$ because u is one-to-one. Then $\mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right]$, a Lebesgue integral taken over Ω, is equal to a Hausdorff integral taken over the set $u\{\Omega\}$, which is justified by a change-of-variables formula for Hausdorff measure.

The second step is to take iterated integration by using an extended version of Fubini's Theorem. To this end, we first note that $u\{\Omega\}$ can be written in a product form of $u\{\Omega\} = S_1 \times S_2$ under mild smoothness conditions, where $S_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-q}$ and $S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ for some integer $q \leq n$. Then similar to that in Example 1, taking integral[2] over the set S_1 yields a function of w, which is in fact a function of the elements in $S_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^q$. More generally, this step can be viewed through an argument on mappings. Specifically, construct a mapping

$$\varphi : u\{\Omega\} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^q.$$

Suppose Hausdorff dimension of the image set $\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}$ is k for some $k \leq q$. Then for any fixed $\mathbf{z} \in \varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}$, Hausdorff dimension of the set $\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}$ is $m-k$. Then fixing $\mathbf{z}$ and taking integral over $\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}$ lead to a function of w as in Examples 1 and 2. This result is stated in the following theorem, whose proof is provided in the appendix.

Theorem 1. *Assume that Assumption 1 holds. Suppose $n \geq m \geq k \leq q$, $u : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ is a continuously differentiable one-to-one mapping, and $\varphi : u\{\Omega\} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^q$ is Lipschitz continuous. If $\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}$ is $(\mathcal{H}^k, k)$ rectifiable, and $J_m^u(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ and $J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ and $\mathbf{y} \in u\{\Omega\}$ up to null sets, then*

$$\mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)\right], \tag{10}$$

where the function w is defined by

$$w(\mathbf{z}) \triangleq \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}) \Bigg/ \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}). \tag{11}$$

Moreover, $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)$ has a smaller variance than $p(\mathbf{X})$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{Var}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)\right] \leq \mathrm{Var}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right].$$

Theorem 1 shows that $w(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X})))$ has the same expectation as $p(\mathbf{X})$, and provides a closed-form expression for the function w. In addition, it shows that $w(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X})))$ has a smaller variance than $p(\mathbf{X})$, which is expected as in conventional CMC.

Theorem 1 works with Hausdorff integrals, aiming to accommodate a more general setting. For a special case when $n = m$, $k = q < n$, and the mapping φ is specified by $\varphi(\mathbf{y}) = (y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ for $\mathbf{y} \triangleq (y_1, \ldots, y_m)$, Hausdorff integrals are equivalent to Lebesgue integrals, and $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})|u_1(\mathbf{X}), \ldots, u_k(\mathbf{X})\right]$.

[2] Hausdorff dimension of S_1 plays an important role in taking integrals. If Hausdorff dimension of S_1 is k for some $k \leq q$, Hausdorff dimension of S_2 should be $m-k$, because Hausdorff dimension of $u\{\Omega\}$ is m.

To better understand the insights offered by Theorem 1, we look into the result in greater detail. Note that by the theorem,

$$\mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right] = \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})|\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right]\right).$$

It is then reasonable to expect that $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right) = \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})|\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right]$, which is also confirmed as a by-product in the proof of the theorem. Compared to conventional CMC that directly conditions on $\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))$, Theorem 1 is meaningful in the following two aspects.

First, Theorem 1 provides a closed-form expression of $\mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})|\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right]$, that applies to a very general simulation model of $\mathbf{X}$, in contrast to conventional CMC where deriving explicit formula of the conditional expectation often relies highly on the structure of $\mathbf{X}$. As seen in Examples 1 and 2, the expression of the function w may lead to estimators with explicit formulas. Derivation of such explicit formulas shall be further exemplified in Section 5 for applications under more practical settings.

Second, Theorem 1 offers great flexibility for us to choose among various mappings u and φ, so as to make use of the form of the integrand $p(\mathbf{X})$. This point shall be made clearer in Section 4 where we construct mappings u and φ to exploit the unique structure of a discontinuous integrand of the form (1), leading to efficient sensitivity estimators.

4 Change-of-Variables Approach for Sensitivity Estimation

In this section we study the change-of-variables approach for sensitivity estimation for a discontinuous integrand of the form (1). In particular, we first provide a general estimator in Theorem 2 for the sensitivity, which applies to general mappings that satisfy mild conditions. We then consider two cases in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, providing sensitivity estimators when the function h in (1) satisfies Conditions 1 and 2, respectively. These estimators require mainly smoothness conditions on h, and their implementation do not require any construction of mappings. We find that the function h encountered in many practical applications satisfies Condition 1 and/or Condition 2. The proposed estimators are, therefore, useful for a wide range of applications.

Recall that our problem is to estimate

$$\alpha'(\xi) \triangleq \frac{d}{d\xi}\mathrm{E}\left[g(\mathbf{X}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X})\leq\xi\}}\right], \tag{12}$$

for given functions g and h, as stated in Section 2.

To facilitate analysis, we make the following smoothness assumption on the function h. Moreover, we let (c_0, c_1) denote the interval in which $h(\mathbf{x})$ may take values for $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, where $c_0 = -\infty$ and $c_1 = \infty$ are allowed. To avoid trivial cases, we assume $\xi \in (c_0, c_1)$.

Assumption 2. *The function $h(\mathbf{x})$ is continuously differentiable for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ up to a Lebesgue null set.*

To analyze the estimation of $\alpha'(\xi)$, we start our discussion with the result in Theorem 1, which can be applied to obtain a function of w such that

$$\alpha(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[g(\mathbf{X}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}) \leq \xi\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X})); \xi\right)\right],$$

where ξ is added as an argument of the function w to explicitly account for the dependence. To enable the use of IPA, one may attempt to construct mappings u and φ such that $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X})); \xi\right)$ is smooth in ξ. To this end, it is natural to take into account the unique structure of $g(\mathbf{X}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}) \leq \xi\}}$ that ξ appears in the indicator function only.

Inspired by Examples 1 and 2, we consider the following mappings:

$$u : \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \mapsto (u_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, u_m(\mathbf{x}), h(\mathbf{x})), \quad \varphi : \mathbf{y} \in u\{\Omega\} \mapsto (y_1, \ldots, y_m), \tag{13}$$

for $\mathbf{x} \triangleq (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ and $\mathbf{y} \triangleq (y_1, \ldots, y_{m+1})$, where $\{u_i, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ are continuously differentiable functions of $\mathbf{x}$.

A common feature of the u mappings we consider is that $h(\mathbf{x})$ serves as the last dimension in the image set, taking integral along which removes discontinuity in the integrand $g(\mathbf{x}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{x}) \leq \xi\}}$. The resulting $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X})); \xi\right)$ is thus continuous in ξ, which enables the use of IPA. For the sake of using change-of-variables formula, we require that u is one-to-one.

It should also be pointed out that u in (13) is in general a mapping from $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ to $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. To ensure that it is one-to-one, Hausforff dimension of the image set $u\{\Omega\}$ should be m. In other words, $u\{\Omega\}$ is an m-dimensional subset in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$. Furthermore, for the integral taken along the last dimension to make sense, Hausdorff dimension of the last coordinate of $u\{\Omega\}$ should be 1, which intuitively implies that for fixed values of the first m coordinates, the last dimension of $u\{\Omega\}$ contains at least a closed interval. In plain words, for any fixed $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, the curve $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : t = h(\mathbf{x}), (u_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, u_m(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{z}\}$ has a positive length. Mathematically, this requirement can be translated to

$$\mathcal{H}^1\left(\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}\right) > 0, \quad \forall\, \mathbf{z} \in \varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\},$$

where by the definition of φ, the set $\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}$ is

$$\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\} = \{(\mathbf{z}, t) \in u\{\Omega\} : t \in (c_0, c_1)\}.$$

Given these conditions, we apply Theorem 1 and have

$$\alpha(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[g(\mathbf{X}) \cdot 1_{\{h(\mathbf{X}) \leq \xi\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X})); \xi\right)\right],$$

where

$$w(\mathbf{z}; \xi) = \int_{c_0}^{\xi} \frac{g(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, t)) f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, t))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, t))} dt \Big/ \int_{c_0}^{c_1} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, t))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z}, t))} dt, \tag{14}$$

where the Jacobians of φ have been cancelled out because $J^{\varphi}_{m-1}(\mathbf{y}) \equiv \sqrt{m}$ for all $\mathbf{y}$.

The function $w(\mathbf{z};\xi)$ in (14) is typically continuous in ξ, because ξ is simply a limit of integration. It is then reasonable to expect that

$$\alpha'(\xi) = \frac{d}{d\xi}\mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{d}{d\xi}w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)\right].$$

This result is summarized in the following theorem, whose proof is provided in the appendix.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that the mappings u and φ are specified as in (13), and u is one-to-one and continuously differentiable. If Assumptions 1-2 hold, $J^u_m(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$, and $\mathcal{H}^1\left(\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}\right) > 0$ for almost all $\mathbf{z} \in \varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}$, then*

$$\alpha(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)\right],$$

where $w(\cdot;\xi)$ is defined in (14).

If, in addition, $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\cdot\right)$ satisfies a Lipschitz continuity condition w.r.t. ξ, i.e., there exists a random variable K with $\mathrm{E}(K) < \infty$ such that for all small enough Δ,

$$\left|w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi+\Delta\right) - w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)\right| \leq K|\Delta|, \quad \textit{with probability 1},$$

then,

$$\alpha'(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[\nu(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi)\right],$$

where

$$\nu(\mathbf{z};\xi) = \frac{g(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z},\xi))f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z},\xi))}{J^u_m(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z},\xi))} \Big/ \int_{c_0}^{c_1} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z},t))}{J^u_m(u^{-1}(\mathbf{z},t))}dt.$$

Remark 1. A special case of the result of Theorem 2 is $g(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 1$ in which the quantity of interest, $\alpha'(\xi)$, is in fact the density of $h(\mathbf{X})$ evaluated at ξ. When Theorem 2 is applicable, a sample-mean estimator can be derived for the density of $h(\mathbf{X})$.

Theorem 2 shows that the sensitivity $\alpha'(\xi)$ is equal to $\mathrm{E}\left[\nu(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi)\right]$, and provides a closed-form expression of the function ν. When the one-dimensional integral in ν can be derived in explicit forms, an explicit formula of ν can be obtained, as in Examples 1 and 2. When explicit formulas are not available, one may resort to one-dimensional numerical integration methods to approximate $\nu(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi)$ for any realization of $\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))$. Efficient one-dimensional numerical integration tools are available in many commercial softwares such as Matlab.

To ensure the validity of interchanging differentiation and expectation, Theorem 2 requires that $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)$ satisfies a Lipschitz continuity condition w.r.t. ξ, which has been a commonly used condition in sensitivity estimation literature; see, e.g., Broadie and Glasserman (1996) and Liu and Hong (2011). This assumption typically does not impose any obstacle in practice, because the

interchange is usually valid when $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)$ is continuous in ξ, which is obviously true by the way w is defined.

A key condition of Theorem 2 is $\mathcal{H}^1\left(\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}\right) > 0$ for any given $\mathbf{z}$, which may not hold in general. This condition also depends on how the u and φ mappings are constructed. In practice, before applying the result in Theorem 2, one may need to construct the mappings and verify this condition accordingly. To reduce simulation practitioners' effort in carrying out verifications, Sections 4.1 and 4.2 consider two cases for which we provide two sufficient conditions imposed on the function h only, and specify explicitly what mappings to be used. These two sufficient conditions are easier to verify. We also note that the function h in many practical applications satisfies either one of the sufficient conditions, or both.

4.1 Case 1

Consider a function h that satisfies the following condition:

Condition 1. *The mapping* $\mathbf{x} \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, h(\mathbf{x}))$ *is one-to-one, and* $\Pr\{\partial_m h(\mathbf{X}) = 0\} = 0$.

We claim that when Condition 1 holds, the key condition of Theorem 2, i.e., $\mathcal{H}^1\left(\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}\right) > 0$ for any given $\mathbf{z}$, is satisfied for appropriate mappings u and φ. To see this, we set $u_i(\mathbf{x}) = x_i$ for $1 \le i \le m-1$ and $u_m(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 1$ in (13). Note that $u_m(\mathbf{x})$ takes a constant value. The mappings in (13) are therefore equivalent to the following:

$$\tilde{u} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1}, h(\mathbf{x})), \quad \tilde{\varphi} : \mathbf{y} \mapsto (y_1, \ldots, y_{m-1}), \tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{y} \triangleq (y_1, \ldots, y_m)$.

To see why Condition 1 implies $\mathcal{H}^1\left(\tilde{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}\right) > 0$ for any given $\mathbf{z}$, we note that when Condition 1 is satisfied, the set $\tilde{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}$ for a given $\mathbf{z}$ is $\{(\mathbf{z}, t) : t \in \mathbb{R}, t = h(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for some } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega\}$, which is indeed a straight line with a positive length because Ω has at least a compact subset and h is continuous by Assumption 2. The condition that $\mathcal{H}^1\left(\tilde{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}\right) > 0$ for almost all $\mathbf{z}$ is therefore satisfied.

It can be easily seen that the Jacobian of $\tilde{u}$ is

$$\tilde{J}(\mathbf{x}) = |\partial_m h(\mathbf{x})|,$$

where $\partial_m h(\mathbf{x})$ denotes the partial derivative of $h(\mathbf{x})$ w.r.t. x_m. Denote $(y_1, \ldots, y_{m-1})$ by $\mathbf{z}$. For any given $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{z}, y_m)$, let $v(\mathbf{z}, y_m)$ denote the solution to the equation $h(\mathbf{z}, x_m) = y_m$, which is unique because $\tilde{u}$ is one-to-one. Then it can be easily seen that

$$\tilde{u}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\mathbf{z}, v(\mathbf{z}, y_m)\right),$$

and $h\left(\tilde{u}^{-1}(\mathbf{y})\right) = y_m$.

Applying Theorem 2, we obtain an expression of $\alpha'(\xi)$. This result is summarized in the following proposition, whose proof is straightforward and thus omitted.

Proposition 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1-2 and Condition 1 are satisfied. Then,*

$$\alpha(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[\widetilde{w}\left(\mathbf{X}_{-m};\xi\right)\right],$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{-m} \triangleq (X_1,\ldots,X_{m-1})$*, and*

$$\widetilde{w}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = \int_{c_0}^{\xi} \frac{g\left(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t)\right) f(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}{\tilde{J}(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}\,dt \Big/ \int_{c_0}^{c_1} \frac{f(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}{\tilde{J}(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}\,dt.$$

If, in addition, $\widetilde{w}(\mathbf{X}_{-m};\cdot)$ *satisfies a Lipschitz continuity condition w.r.t.* ξ *as in Theorem 2, then,*

$$\alpha'(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[\widetilde{\nu}\left(\mathbf{X}_{-m};\xi\right)\right],$$

where

$$\widetilde{\nu}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = \frac{g\left(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},\xi)\right) f(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},\xi))}{\tilde{J}(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},\xi))} \Big/ \int_{c_0}^{c_1} \frac{f(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}{\tilde{J}(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}\,dt. \tag{16}$$

Remark 2. It should be pointed out that the result in Proposition 1 still applies if we change the mapping in Condition 1 to

$$\mathbf{x} \mapsto \left(x_{i_1},\ldots,x_{i_{m-1}},h(\mathbf{x})\right)$$

for any permutation $(i_1,\ldots,i_m)$ of $\{1,\ldots,m\}$. We only need to change the indices of the function arguments accordingly. This offers more flexibility to verify Condition 1 in practice.

Proposition 1 shows that under appropriate conditions, $\alpha'(\xi)$ can be estimated by a sample mean of $\widetilde{\nu}\left(\mathbf{X}_{-m};\xi\right)$, where the function $\widetilde{\nu}$ is specified in (16). For any given $\mathbf{z}$, evaluation of the function $\widetilde{\nu}$ requires knowing $v(\mathbf{z},t)$ that is in fact the inverse of $h(\mathbf{z},x_m)$ as a function of x_m. When an explicit formula of $v(\mathbf{z},t)$ can be derived, the evaluation is straightforward. When explicit formulas are not available, in principle it can be approximated by numerically solving the equation $h(\mathbf{z},x_m)=t$ by using, e.g., one-dimensional line search methods. For instance, when $t=\xi$, $v(\mathbf{z},\xi)$ can be approximated by line search algorithms for any given $\mathbf{z}$. However, evaluation of the denominator term of $\widetilde{\nu}$ may require line search operations for all possible $\mathbf{z}$'s and a grid of t's in (c_0,c_1), which may be too computationally expensive to afford.

To resolve this issue, we may further apply a change of variables on the denominator term. Specifically, for any given $\mathbf{z}$, consider the one-to-one mapping $t \mapsto v(\mathbf{z},t)$. Recall that by Assumption 2 and the inverse function theorem, $v(\mathbf{z},t)$ is continuously differentiable in t, and the Jacobian

$$\left|\frac{dv(\mathbf{z},t)}{dt}\right| = \frac{1}{|\partial_m h(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))|}.$$

Then by the change-of-variables formula, it can be easily verified that

$$\int_{c_0}^{c_1} \frac{f(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}{\tilde{J}(\mathbf{z},v(\mathbf{z},t))}\,dt = \int_{\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{z})} f(\mathbf{z},s)\,ds, \tag{17}$$

where $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{z})$ denotes the set in which x_m takes values, i.e., $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{z}) = \{s : (\mathbf{z}, s) \in \Omega\}$. From (17), it can be seen that the denominator term of $\widetilde{\nu}$ is indeed the density function of $\mathbf{X}_{-m}$ evaluated at $\mathbf{z}$. It can be evaluated based on the integral on the RHS of (17), which can be efficiently done by one-dimensional integration methods and does not require knowing the function $v(\mathbf{z}, t)$.

We close the discussion for Case 1 by a remark on Condition 1. Many functions of h in practical applications may satisfy Condition 1, e.g., $h(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + x_2$ and $h(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^2 + \exp(x_1^3 x_2)$. In practice, the requirement of the mapping being one-to-one in Condition 1 may be violated for some functions, and some modifications may fix this issue. For instance, the mapping is not one-to-one when $h(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + x_2^2$. In this case, we may either change the mapping to $\mathbf{x} \mapsto (x_2, h(\mathbf{x}))$, or divide the support of $\mathbf{X}$ into two parts, $\Omega \cap \{\mathbf{x} : x_2 \geq 0\}$ and $\Omega \cap \{\mathbf{x} : x_2 < 0\}$, and apply Proposition 1 to each part separately.

However, such modifications may not work for some cases where Condition 1 is violated. For instance, in a commonly encountered case where $h(\mathbf{x}) = \max(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, the mapping in Condition 1 is obviously not one-to-one. To deal with such cases, we study another sufficient condition in the following subsection.

4.2 Case 2

We consider a function of h that is homogeneous, i.e.,

Condition 2. *The function h is homogeneous, i.e., $h(t\mathbf{x}) = t\mathbf{x}$ for $t > 0$.*

Homogeneous functions include, for example, the maximum function $h(\mathbf{x}) = \max(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, the minimum function $h(\mathbf{x}) = \min(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$, linear functions $h(\mathbf{x}) = a_1 x_1 + \cdots + a_m x_m$. These homogeneous functions find important applications in a wide range of areas in operations research.

For homogeneous functions of h, we consider the following mapping

$$\bar{u} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto (x_1/h(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, x_m/h(\mathbf{x}), h(\mathbf{x})), \quad \bar{\varphi} : \mathbf{y} \mapsto (y_1, \ldots, y_m), \tag{18}$$

for $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_m, y_{m+1})$.

In this case, we work with a modified version of $\mathbf{X}$'s support, $\Omega' = \Omega \backslash \{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega : h(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$, to avoid zeros values for denominators. When h is continuously differentiable, this modification does not change the result of our analysis. This is because $\mathbf{X}$ is a continuous random vector, and thus $\Pr(h(\mathbf{X}) = 0) = 0$. Therefore, ignoring the set $\{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega : h(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$ does not affect our analysis on integrations.

The key condition of Theorem 2 that $\mathcal{H}^1\left(\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}\right) > 0$ for any given $\mathbf{z}$ is satisfied when h is homogeneous and the mappings are set as in (18). To see this, we only need to verify the condition for two possible scenarios. The first scenario considers a given $\mathbf{z}$ for which there exists an $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}_0/h(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and $h(\mathbf{x}_0) > 0$. Since (c_0, c_1) is the interval in which $h(\mathbf{x})$ takes values, we can

see that $c_1 > 0$, and

$$\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\} = \{(\mathbf{z},t) \in \bar{u}\{\Omega'\} : t \in (c_0, c_1)\} = \{(\mathbf{z},t) : t \in (c_0, c_1), h(t\mathbf{z}) = t\} = \{(\mathbf{z},t) : t \in (0, c_1)\},$$

where the last equality follows from Condition 2 that $h(t\mathbf{z}) = th(\mathbf{z}) = th(\mathbf{x}_0)/h(\mathbf{x}_0) = t$ for all $t > 0$. Therefore, $\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}$ is a straight line and has positive length, i.e, $\mathcal{H}^1(\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}) > 0$. The second scenario considers a given $\mathbf{z}$ for which there exists an $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}_0/h(\mathbf{x}_0)$ and $h(\mathbf{x}_0) < 0$. Then $c_0 < 0$, and

$$\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\} = \{(\mathbf{z},t) \in \bar{u}\{\Omega'\} : t \in (c_0, c_1)\} = \{(\mathbf{z},t) : t \in (c_0, c_1), h(t\mathbf{z}) = t\} = \{(\mathbf{z},t) : t \in (c_0, 0)\},$$

where the last equality follows from Condition 2 that for any $t < 0$,

$$h(t\mathbf{z}) = -th(-\mathbf{z}) = -th(\mathbf{x}_0/(-h(\mathbf{x}_0))) = -th(\mathbf{x}_0)/(-h(\mathbf{x}_0)) = t,$$

because $h(\mathbf{x}_0) < 0$. Therefore, $\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}$ is a straight line and has positive length, i.e., $\mathcal{H}^1(\bar{\varphi}^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}) > 0$.

It can be easily check that the mapping $\bar{u}$ is continuously differentiable because h is continuously differentiable. It is also one-to-one, and $\bar{u}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}) = t\mathbf{z}$ for any $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{z},t) \in \bar{u}\{\Omega'\}$. Moreover, the Jacobian of $\bar{u}$ has a neat form. By elementary algebra, the m-dimensional Jacobian of $\bar{u}$ is

$$\bar{J}_m^{\bar{u}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{\frac{(\partial_1 h(\mathbf{x}))^2 + \cdots + (\partial_m h(\mathbf{x}))^2}{h^{2(m-1)}(\mathbf{x})}},$$

where $\partial_i h$ denotes the partial derivative of $h(\mathbf{x})$ w.r.t. x_i for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Define

$$\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) = \frac{1}{|t|^{m-1}}\sqrt{(\partial_1 h(t\mathbf{z}))^2 + \cdots + (\partial_m h(t\mathbf{z}))^2}.$$

Then it can be verified that

$$\bar{J}_m^{\bar{u}}(\bar{u}^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) = \bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) \,/ |h(\mathrm{sign}(t)\mathbf{z})|^{m-1}\ , \quad \forall\ \mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{z},t) \in u\{\Omega'\},$$

where $\mathrm{sign}(t)$ is a sign function that is equal to 1 if $t > 0$ and -1 if $t < 0$.

Applying the result of Theorem 2, we arrive at an expression of $\alpha'(\xi)$, which is summarized in the following proposition, whose proof is a direct application of Theorem 2 and thus omitted.

Proposition 2. *If Assumptions 1-2 and Condition 2 are satisfied, then*

$$\alpha(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[\bar{w}\left(\mathbf{X}/h(\mathbf{X}); \xi\right)\right],$$

where

$$\bar{w}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = \int_{c_0}^{\xi} |h(sign(t)\mathbf{z})|^{m-1} g(t\mathbf{z}) f(t\mathbf{z}) / \bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) dt \Big/ \int_{c_0}^{c_1} |h(sign(t)\mathbf{z})|^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z}) / \bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) dt.$$

If, in addition, $\bar{w}(\mathbf{X}/h(\mathbf{X});\cdot)$ satisfies a Lipschitz continuity condition w.r.t. ξ as in Theorem 2, then

$$\alpha'(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[\bar{\nu}(\mathbf{X}/h(\mathbf{X});\xi)\right],$$

where

$$\bar{\nu}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = \frac{|h(sign(\xi)\mathbf{z})|^{m-1} g(\xi\mathbf{z}) f(\xi\mathbf{z})}{\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},\xi)} \Big/ \int_{c_0}^{c_1} \frac{|h(sign(t)\mathbf{z})|^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z})}{\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t)} dt.$$

To illustrate how Proposition 2 can be applied to derive estimators for different functions of h. We consider three examples, where h is chosen to be a maximum function, a linear function, and a quadratic function, respectively, i.e., $h(\mathbf{x}) = \max(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$, $h(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + \ldots + x_m$ and $h(\mathbf{x}) = x_1^2 + \cdots + x_m^2$.

Example 3. When $h(\mathbf{x}) = \max(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$, $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^m$ and $\xi > 0$, it can be easily verified that $\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) = 1/t^{m-1}$. Applying Proposition 2, we have

$$\bar{w}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = \int_0^{\xi} g(t\mathbf{z}) t^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z}) dt \Big/ \int_0^{\infty} t^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z}) dt,$$

and

$$\bar{\nu}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = g(\xi\mathbf{z})\xi^{m-1} f(\xi\mathbf{z}) \Big/ \int_0^{\infty} t^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z}) dt\ .$$

When $h(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + \cdots + x_m$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}_+^m$, it can be verified that $\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) = \sqrt{m}/t^{m-1}$, and $\bar{w}(\mathbf{z};\xi)$ and $\bar{\nu}(\mathbf{z};\xi)$ have the same forms as those for the maximum function.

When $h(x) = x_1^2 + \ldots + x_m^2$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^m$, we work with $\sqrt{h(\mathbf{x})}$ which satisfies Condition 2. Then applying Proposition 2 leads to

$$\bar{w}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = \int_0^{\xi^2} g(t\mathbf{z}) t^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z}) dt \Big/ \int_0^{\infty} t^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z}) dt,$$

and

$$\bar{\nu}(\mathbf{z};\xi) = 2\xi g(\xi^2\mathbf{z})\xi^{2m-2} f(\xi^2\mathbf{z}) \Big/ \int_0^{\infty} t^{m-1} f(t\mathbf{z}) dt\ .$$

5 Applications

5.1 Estimating Price Sensitivities for Financial Options

In financial risk management, the Greek letters of options play an important role in constructing hedging strategies. Mathematically, the Greek letters of an option are defined as the sensitivities of the option price with respect to market parameters such as underlying asset prices, volatilities and risk-free interest rate. When the payoff of the option is discontinuous, estimating the Greek letters

has been a challenging problem in simulation. In what follows, we apply the change-of-variables approach to estimate the Greek letters for options with discontinuous payoffs.

Typically, the (discounted) payoff of an option with a discontinuous payoff is of the form

$$l(\mathbf{X})\prod_{i=1}^{q}1_{\{h_i(\mathbf{X})\le a_i\}}, \tag{19}$$

for Lipschitz continuous functions l and h_i's, where $\mathbf{X}=(X_1,\ldots,X_m)$ is a random vector that represents the price dynamics of the underlying asset and depends on a market parameter θ, and for notational ease we suppress this dependence when there is no confusion. Without loss of generality, we assume that θ is a scalar. Based on Theorem 1 of Liu and Hong (2011), a Greek letter associated with the market parameter θ is represented as

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{d\theta}\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})\prod_{i=1}^{q}1_{\{h_i(\mathbf{X})\le a_i\}}\right]\\ &\quad=\ \mathrm{E}\left[\partial_\theta l(\mathbf{X})\prod_{i=1}^{q}1_{\{h_i(\mathbf{X})\le a_i\}}\right]-\sum_{i=1}^{q}\frac{d}{da_i}\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})\partial_\theta h_i(\mathbf{X})\prod_{k\ne i}1_{\{h_k(\mathbf{X})\le a_k\}}\cdot 1_{\{h_i(\mathbf{X})\le a_i\}}\right],\end{aligned}$$

where ∂_θ denotes the operator of takin derivative with respect to θ.

Note that in a simulation run, both $\{l(\mathbf{X}),h_i(\mathbf{X}),1\le i\le q\}$ and their pathwise derivatives $\{\partial_\theta l(\mathbf{X}),\partial_\theta h_i(\mathbf{X}),1\le i\le q\}$ are usually readily computable; see, e.g., Broadie and Glasserman (1996). The first term on the RHS of the above equation can then be easily estimated by a sample-mean estimator. In the rest of this subsection, we will discuss how to estimate the second term using the change-of-variables approach.

To simplify notation, we let

$$g_i(\mathbf{X})=l(\mathbf{X})\partial_\theta h_i(\mathbf{X})\prod_{k\ne i}1_{\{h_k(\mathbf{X})\le a_k\}}.$$

Then the problem is reduced to how to estimate

$$\beta_i\triangleq\frac{d}{da_i}\mathrm{E}\left[g_i(\mathbf{X})\cdot 1_{\{h_i(\mathbf{X})\le a_i\}}\right],\quad i=1,\ldots,q.$$

For many options traded in financial markets, the function $h_i(\mathbf{X})$ in their payoffs is often in the form of $h_i(\mathbf{X})=X_m$, $h_i(\mathbf{X})=\sum_{i=1}^{m}X_i/m$, $h_i(\mathbf{X})=\max(X_1,\ldots,X_m)$, or $h_i(\mathbf{X})=\min(X_1,\ldots,X_m)$; see, e.g., Tong and Liu (2016) for more detailed discussions. It can be easily seen that these are all homogenous functions and satisfy Condition 2. Applying Proposition 2, we have

$$\beta_i=\frac{d}{da_i}\mathrm{E}\left[g_i(\mathbf{X})\cdot 1_{\{h_i(\mathbf{X})\le a_i\}}\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[\nu\left(\mathbf{Z};a_i\right)\right],$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \triangleq (X_1/h_i(\mathbf{X}), \ldots, X_m/h_i(\mathbf{X}))$, and

$$\nu(\mathbf{z}; a_i) = g_i(\mathbf{z}a_i)a_i^{m-1}f(\mathbf{z}a_i) \Big/ \int_0^\infty t^{m-1}f(t\mathbf{z})dt \ .$$

It turns out that the same form of ν applies to all β_i, $i = 1, \ldots, q$.

Deriving an explicit formula of $\nu(\mathbf{z}; a_i)$ requires knowing the joint density function f, which is available for many commonly used pricing models, for instance, when $\mathbf{X}$ represents the underlying asset prices observed at different time points under the Black-Scholes model. As a remark, it is worth pointing out that this requirement can be further relaxed. Indeed, one may replace f by a conditional density of $\mathbf{X}$ given some variables. This relaxation offers considerable flexibility during implementation, as conditional densities can often be obtained for most, if not all, pricing models for financial options. As an illustrative example, we derive $\nu(\mathbf{z}; a_i)$ for the more complex variance gamma model using a conditional density where an explicit joint density is not available; see Section B.1.2 of the online supplement for more details.

When estimating β_i, we generate n identically and independently distributed (i.i.d.) observations of $\mathbf{X}$, denoted by $\{\mathbf{X}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{X}_n\}$, and compute

$$\mathbf{Z}_k = \left(\frac{X_{k,1}}{h_i(\mathbf{X}_k)}, \ldots, \frac{X_{k,m}}{h_i(\mathbf{X}_k)}\right), \quad k = 1, \ldots, n,$$

where $\mathbf{X}_k = (X_{k,1}, \ldots, X_{k,m})$.

Then β_i can be estimated by

$$\bar{M}_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \nu(\mathbf{Z}_k; a_i).$$

It is worth mentioning that $\bar{M}_n$ is an unbiased estimator, thus it has desirable asymptotic properties as a typical sample-mean estimator. Although it involves another random vector $\mathbf{Z}$, the estimator does not require any change of probability measures in the simulation, because $\mathbf{Z}$ is readily computable once $\mathbf{X}$ is generated.

5.1.1 Numerical Experiments

We consider two pricing models, the Black-Scholes (BS) model and the variance gamma (VG) model, to conduct numerical experiments and examine the performances of the estimators. In particular, the price of the underlying asset is monitored at m time points $\{t_1 < \cdots < t_m\}$ evenly spaced over $(0, T)$, i.e., $t_i = iT/m$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$, where T is the maturity date of the option. To simplify notation, we let X_i denote the underlying asset price at t_i for $i = 0, \ldots, m$.

Under the BS model, the price of the underlying asset is governed by a geometric Brownian motion, i.e.,

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \exp\left((r - \sigma^2/2)T/m + \sigma\sqrt{T/m}N_{i+1}\right), \quad i = 0, \ldots, m-1,$$

where $\{N_1, \ldots, N_m\}$ are independent standard normal random variables, r and σ denote the risk-free interest rate and volatility of the underlying asset. Denote the initial price of the underlying asset by $X_0 = x_0$. The joint density of $\mathbf{X}$ is then

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{T/m}x_{i+1}} \phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{T/m}}\left(\log(x_{i+1}/x_i) - (r - \sigma^2/2)T/m\right)\right),$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ denotes the standard normal density function.

Compared to the BS model, the VG model is a pure jump process and allows for more flexible skewness and kurtosis; see, e.g., Madan et al. (1998). A discretization of the VG model is given by (Fu 2000),

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \exp(\mu T/m + \theta G_{i+1} + \sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}}N_{i+1}), \quad i = 0, \ldots, m-1,$$

where $\{G_1, \ldots, G_m\}$ are independent gamma random variables with scale parameter $T/(m\beta)$ and shape parameter β, $\{N_1, \ldots, N_m\}$ are independent standard normal random variables, $\mu = r + 1/\beta \log(1 - \theta\beta - \sigma^2\beta/2)$, and θ and σ are parameters of the model. Then the conditional density of $\mathbf{X}$ given $\mathbf{G} \triangleq (G_1, \ldots, G_m)$ is

$$f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{x_{i+1}\sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}}} \phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}}}\left(\log(x_{i+1}/x_i) - \mu T/m - \theta G_{i+1}\right)\right).$$

Under each of the BS and VG models, we consider three options with discontinuous payoffs, including a digital option with discounted payoff $e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m \geq K\}}$, an Asian digital option with discounted payoff $e^{-rT}1_{\{\sum_{i=1}^m X_i/m \geq K\}}$, and a barrier call option with discounted payoff $e^{-rT}(X_m - K)^+ 1_{\{\max(X_1,\ldots,X_m)\leq\kappa\}}$, where K and κ denote the strike price and the barrier respectively. For each of the above options, we estimate the Greek letters `delta` and `gamma`, i.e., the first- and second-order derivatives of the option price w.r.t. x_0, and `theta` and `vega`, i.e., the first-order derivatives of the option price w.r.t. T and σ, respectively. We compare the proposed change-of-variables estimators to existing ones in the literature, including the likelihood ratio method and conventional CMC when applicable. Detailed derivation of various estimators is provided in Section B.1 of the online supplement.

In all experiments, we set the sample size as $n = 10^5$. To examine the performance of an estimator $\bar{M}_n$, we use its relative error, defined as the ratio of the standard deviation of $\bar{M}_n$ to the absolute value of the quantity being estimated. True values of the quantities being estimated are either computed by closed-form formulas when available, or approximated using other existing methods with an extremely large sample size (10^9).

For the options under the BS model, we let $x_0 = K = 100$, $\kappa = 120$, $r = 5\%$, $\sigma = 0.3$, and $T = 1$. We vary the number of discretization steps, m, to examine its impact on the performances of various estimators, including the likelihood ratio (LR) estimator, conventional CMC estimator, and the proposed change-of-variables (CoV) estimator. Comparison results for the digital, Asian

and barrier options are summarized in Tables 1, 2 and 3, respectively. From these tables it can be seen that the proposed CoV estimators have the best performances in all settings. Its improvement upon existing methods can be dramatic. For instance, when estimating `gamma` for the Asian digital option with $m = 100$, relative errors of the LR and conventional CMC estimators are over 10 and 1000 times of that of the CoV estimator respectively, implying that sample sizes of the LR and CMC estimators have to be as large as 100 and 10^6 times of that of the CoV estimator in order to achieve the same level of accuracy. For the barrier option, it is not clear how conventional CMC estimators can be derived, while the proposed CoV estimators perform very well.

Table 1: Relative errors (%) of various Greek estimators for the digital option under the BS model

	`delta`			`vega`			`theta`			`gamma`		
m	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV
10	1.8	0.4	0.4	7.9	0.4	0.4	23.0	0.4	0.4	24.9	3.3	3.3
50	4.0	0.6	0.6	17.8	0.6	0.6	51.1	0.4	0.4	125	11.1	11.1
100	5.6	0.8	0.8	25.0	0.8	0.8	71.8	0.4	0.4	252	18.7	18.7

Table 2: Relative errors (%) of various Greek estimators for the Asian digital option under the BS model

	`delta`			`vega`			`theta`			`gamma`		
m	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV
10	1.1	1.1	0.2	10.0	1.1	0.2	28.8	0.7	0.5	14.9	86.2	2.5
50	2.3	3.7	0.4	22.8	3.7	0.4	64.0	2.1	0.5	74.1	3210	8.6
100	3.3	6.3	0.6	32.7	6.2	0.6	91.3	3.5	0.6	151	15164	14.4

Table 3: Relative errors (%) of various Greek estimators for the barrier call option under the BS model

	`delta`		`vega`		`theta`		`gamma`	
m	LR	CoV	LR	CoV	LR	CoV	LR	CoV
10	5.5	5.6	2.6	0.5	2.6	0.7	5.6	3.0
50	11.1	5.6	5.9	0.8	5.9	1.1	41.7	11.2
100	15.1	6.2	8.3	0.9	8.3	1.3	84.9	19.8

For options under the VG model, we let $x_0 = K = 100$, $\kappa = 120$, $r = 5\%$, $\sigma = 0.2$, $\beta = 10$, $\theta = -0.2$, and $T = 1$. Comparison results for the digital, Asian and barrier options are summarized

in Tables 4, 5 and 6, respectively. From the tables it can be seen that the proposed CoV estimators significantly outperform the existing estimators in many cases. For instance, when estimating `theta` for the Asian option with $m = 100$, relative errors of the LR and conventional CMC estimators are over 280 and 10 times of that of the CoV estimator.

Table 4: Relative errors (%) of various Greek estimators for the digital option under the VG model

	`delta`			`vega`			`theta`			`gamma`		
k	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV
10	1.7	0.4	0.4	14.9	0.5	0.5	31.1	0.3	0.3	383	52.9	52.8
50	3.9	0.7	0.7	32.1	0.7	0.7	68.5	0.5	0.5	1343	121	121
100	5.4	0.8	0.8	44.8	0.8	0.8	97.2	0.6	0.6	2579	197	197

Table 5: Relative errors (%) of various Greek estimators for the Asian digital option under the VG model

	`delta`			`vega`			`theta`			`gamma`		
k	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV	LR	CMC	CoV
10	1.0	1.1	0.2	14.9	1.4	0.3	35.8	0.9	0.2	34.8	188	5.6
50	2.3	3.9	0.5	33.2	4.2	0.5	80.0	2.5	0.3	171	7007	19.8
100	3.2	6.7	0.6	46.8	6.8	0.6	112	4.2	0.4	323	34262	32

Table 6: Relative errors (%) of various Greek estimators for the barrier call option under the VG model

	`delta`		`vega`		`theta`		`gamma`	
k	LR	CoV	LR	CoV	LR	CoV	LR	CoV
10	8.7	5.6	3.1	1.1	11.0	0.6	7.3	2.3
50	50.4	19.5	6.1	1.6	22.3	0.9	40.0	7.8
100	106	35.2	8.3	1.9	29.7	1.0	72.5	12.9

5.2 Estimating Gradient of Chance Constrained Programs

Consider a chance constrained program

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{t}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & r(\mathbf{t}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \Pr\{L(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{X}) \leq 0\} \geq \beta, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $\mathbf{t} \triangleq (t_1, \ldots, t_m)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$ represents the vector of decision variables, $r(\mathbf{t})$ is a deterministic objective function, $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)^T$ is an m-dimensional random vector, L is a known function, and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is a parameter specified by the modeler.

Sample average approximation (SAA) is a popular method for solving the chance constrained program (20); see, e.g., Luedtke and Ahmed (2008) and Pagnoncelli et al. (2009). To use SAA, it would be helpful if one has an estimate of the gradient of the constraint, i.e.,

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{t}} \Pr\{L(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{X}) \leq 0\}.$$

To illustrate how the change-of-variables approach can be applied to estimate this gradient, we consider an example where L is linear, i.e.,

$$L(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} - b,$$

where b is a given constant.

By using Theorem 1 of Liu and Hong (2011), it can be shown that for $i = 1, \ldots, m$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} \Pr\{L(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{X}) \leq 0\} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial b} \mathrm{E}\left[X_i \cdot 1_{\{\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\}}\right].$$

Let $h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{x}$. It is straightforward that Condition 2 is satisfied. Applying Proposition 2, we have

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{t}} \Pr\left\{\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\right\} = \mathrm{E}\left[\nu(\mathbf{Z}; b)\right], \tag{21}$$

where

$$\nu(\mathbf{Z}; b) = -\frac{b\mathbf{Z}f(b\mathbf{Z})|b|^{m-1}}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t\mathbf{Z})|t|^{m-1}dt},$$

where f is the density function of $\mathbf{X}$, and $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X}/t^T\mathbf{X}$.

When estimating the gradient, we generate n i.i.d. observations of $\mathbf{X}$, denoted by $\{\mathbf{X}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{X}_n\}$, and compute $\mathbf{Z}_k = \mathbf{X}_k/\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X}_k$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Then the gradient can be estimated by

$$\bar{M}_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} \nu(\mathbf{Z}_k; b).$$

5.2.1 Numerical Experiments

Numerical experiments are conducted to illustrate the performance of the gradient estimator resulting from (21). In particular, we estimate $\partial_{t_1} \Pr\left\{\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\right\}$ at $\mathbf{t} = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$. We vary b to examine the performance of the estimator in different settings. More specifically, we choose b such that the probability of $\{\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\}$ takes values in $\{0.90, 0.95, 0.99\}$.

Consider two cases, where $\mathbf{X}$ follows a multivariate normal and a multivariate Student's t-distribution respectively. Detailed derivation of explicit formulas for ν in (21) is provided in Section

B.2 of the online supplement. In our numerical setting, we let the means of the distributions be zero and the covariance matrix Σ is specified in a way that individual X_i has a unit variance while every pair (X_i, X_j) has a correlation ρ when $i \neq j$. We let $\rho = 0.3$ in the numerical experiments, and the degrees of freedom be 4 for the multivariate t-distribution.

We compare the estimators resulting from the proposed change-of-variables (CoV) approach to conventional CMC estimators. To measure the performance of an estimator, we report its relative error. In addition, we report the ratio of the relative error of the conventional CMC estimator to that of the CoV estimator. In all experiments, we set the sample size n as 10^5. Numerical results are summarized in Tables 7 and 8 for the multivariate normal and t cases, respectively. From the tables it can be seen that the proposed CoV estimator performs better in all settings. Its performance is significantly better than conventional CMC in some cases. For instance, for the multivariate t case with $m = 50$ and a probability level of 99%, the ratio of their relative errors is over 10, implying that the sample size of the conventional CMC estimator has to be as large as 100 times of that of the CoV estimator in order to achieve the same level of accuracy.

Table 7: Relative errors (%) and performance ratios of the conventional CMC and CoV estimators for the multivariate normal case.

	$m = 5$			$m = 10$			$m = 50$		
$\Pr\{\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\}$	0.90	0.95	0.99	0.90	0.95	0.99	0.90	0.95	0.99
CMC	0.7	0.9	1.7	1.2	1.4	2.6	2.9	3.5	6.4
CoV	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.7
Ratio	1.5	1.7	2.3	1.7	2.0	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.7

Table 8: Relative errors (%) and performance ratios of the conventional CMC and CoV estimators for the multivariate t case.

	$m = 5$			$m = 10$			$m = 50$		
$\Pr\{\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\}$	0.90	0.95	0.99	0.90	0.95	0.99	0.90	0.95	0.99
CMC	0.9	1.1	2.3	1.4	1.7	3.5	3.4	4.2	8.3
CoV	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.8
Ratio	2.0	2.4	4.2	2.6	3.2	5.2	5.4	6.6	10.6

6 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we propose a change-of-variables approach to CMC, and provide theoretical underpinnings. We attempt to circumvent the difficulty on finding conditioning variables for CMC. To this end, we provide sensitivity estimators for discontinuous integrands under appropriate smoothness conditions. Many practical applications may fit into our setting. We show that the proposed approach may lead to new estimators, exemplified by two applications, including estimation of sensitivities of financial options with discontinuous payoffs and gradient estimation of chance constrained programs.

The change-of-variables approach might also find applications in other simulation problems, e.g., sampling in a hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^n$ from a given distribution. In principle, sampling from an properly chosen distribution in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and then mapping the generated samples to the hyperplane might achieve the goal. However, how to design the mapping is challenging, and it is left as a topic for future research.

Acknowledgements

The research of the second author is partially supported by the Hong Kong Research Grants Council under grants CityU 155312 and 192313.

References

Asmussen, S., and P. W. Glynn. 2007. *Stochastic Simulation: Algorithms and Analysis*, Springer, New York.

Bernis, G., E. Gobet and A. Kohatsu-Higa. 2003. Monte Carlo evaluation of Greeks for multidimensional barrier and lookback options. *Mathematical Finance*, **13** 99-113.

Broadie, M., and P. Glasserman. 1996. Estimating security price derivatives using simulation. *Management Science*, **42** 269-285.

Chan, J. H. and M. Joshi. 2013. Fast Monte Carlo Greeks for financial products with discontinuous pay-offs. *Mathematical Finance*, **23**(3) 459-495.

Chen, N., and P. Glasserman. 2007. Malliavin Greeks without Malliavin calculus. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, **117**:1689-1723.

Durrett, R. 2005. *Probability: Theory and Examples*, Third Edition. Duxbury Press, Belmont.

Federer, H. 1996. *Geometric Measure Theory*, Reprint of the 1969 Edition, Springer, Berlin.

Fu, M. C. 2000. Variance-Gamma and Monte Carlo. M. C. Fu, R. A. Jarrow, J.-Y. Yen, and R. J. Elliott eds. *Advances in Mathematical Finance*. Boston, Birkhauser.

Fu, M. C., L. J. Hong, and J.-Q. Hu. 2009. Conditional Monte Carlo estimation of quantile

sensitivities. *Management Science*, **55**, 2019-2027.

Fu, M. C., and J.-Q. Hu. 1997. *Conditional Monte Carlo: Gradient Estimation and Optimization Applications*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA.

Glynn, P. W. 1987. Likelihood ratio gradient estimation: An overview. *Proceedings of the 1987 Winter Simulation Conference*, 366-374.

Gong, W. B., and Y. C. Ho. 1987. Smoothed perturbation analysis of discrete-event dynamic systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, **32**, 858-867.

Hammersley, J. M. 1956. Conditional Monte Carlo. *Journal of the ACM*, **3** 73-76.

Ho, Y. C., and X.-R. Cao. 1983. Perturbation analysis and optimization of queueing networks. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, **40** 559-582.

Law, A. M., and W. D. Kelton. 2000. *Simulation Modeling and Analysis*, Third Edition, McGraw-Hill.

Liu, G., and L. J. Hong. 2011. Kernel estimation of the Greeks for options with discontinuous payoffs. *Operations Research*, **59** 96-108.

L'Ecuyer, P. 1990. A unified view of the IPA, SF, and LR gradient estimation technique. *Management Science*, **36**, 1364-1383.

Luedtke, J., S. Ahmed. 2008. A sample approximation approach for optimization with probabilistic constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, **19**(2) 674-699.

Lyuu, Y.-D.,and H.-W. Teng. 2011. Unbiased and efficient Greeks of financial options. *Finance and Stochastics*, **15** 141-181.

Madan, D. B., P. Carr, and E. C. Chang. 1998. The variance gamma process and option pricing. *European Finance Review*, **2** 79-105.

Malý, J. 2001. Lectures on change of variables in integral. Preprint 305, Department of Mathematics, University of Helsinki.

Morgan, F. 2009. *Geometric Measure Theory: A Beginner's Guide*, 3rd Edition, Academic Press.

Pagnoncelli, B. K., S. Ahmed, A. Shapiro. 2009. Sample average approximation method for chance constrained programming: Theory and applications. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, **142** 399-416.

Pflug, G. C. 1988. *Derivatives of Probability Measures: Concepts and Applications to the Optimization of Stochastic Systems.* Springer, Berlin.

Pflug, G. C., and H. Weisshaupt. 2005. Probability gradient estimation by set-valued calculus and applications in network design. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, **15**(3) 898-914.

Suri, R., and M. A. Zazanis. 1988. Perturbation analysis gives strongly consistent sensitivity estimates for the M/G/1 queue. *Management Science*, **34**, 39-64.

Tong, S., and G. Liu. 2016. Importance sampling for option Greeks with discontinuous payoffs. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, in press.

Wang Y., M. C. Fu, and S. I. Marcus. 2009. Sensitivity analysis for barrier options. *Proceedings of the 2009 Winter Simulation Conference*, 1272-1282.

Wang, Y., M. C. Fu, and S. I. Marcus. 2012. A new stochastic derivative estimator for discontinuous payoff functions with application to financial derivatives. *Operations Research*, **60**(2) 447-460.

Wendel, J. G. 1957. Groups and conditional Monte Carlo. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **28** 1048-1052.

A Appendix

In what follows we provide the proofs of the main results. To facilitate the proofs, an area formula and a coarea formula for Hausdorff integrations will be used repeatedly. Interested readers are referred to Malý (2001, Theorem 4.6, Exercise 3) for details of the area formula, and to Federer (1996, Theorems 3.2.22 and 3.2.31) for those of the coarea formula.

Lemma 1 (Area Formula)**.** *Let $E_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be an open set, and $u : E_0 \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuously differentiable one-to-one mapping, $n \geq m$. Then for any Borel set $E \subset E_0$ we have*

$$\int_E J_m^u(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \int_{u\{E\}} \mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{H}^m(u\{E\}). \tag{22}$$

Furthermore,

$$\int_E p(u(\mathbf{x}))J_m^u(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x} = \int_{u\{E\}} p(\mathbf{y})\mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}), \tag{23}$$

for all Borel functions $p : u\{E\} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ for which one side exists.

Lemma 2 (Coarea Formula)**.** *Suppose $n \geq m \geq k \leq q$ are positive integers, A is an $(\mathcal{H}^m, m)$ rectifiable Borel set of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $E \subset \mathbb{R}^q$, and the mapping $\varphi : A \to E$ is Lipschitz continuous. Then,*

(a) If $\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}) > 0$ for $\mathcal{H}^k$ almost all $\mathbf{z}$ in E, then E is $(\mathcal{H}^k, k)$ rectifiable.

(b) If E is $(\mathcal{H}^k, k)$ rectifiable, then the set $\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}$ is $(\mathcal{H}^{m-k}, m-k)$ rectifiable for $\mathcal{H}^k$ almost all $\mathbf{z}$, and

$$\int_A p(\mathbf{y})J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})\mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}) = \int_E \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} p(\mathbf{y})\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y})\mathcal{H}^k(d\mathbf{z}),$$

where $p(\cdot)$ is an $\mathcal{H}^m$ integrable function.

The area formula can be viewed as a generalization of the concept of change of variables in integration. When $n = m$, it is the typically change-of-variables formula in calculus. This extension to cases with $n > m$ provides a powerful tool for computing integrals taken over m-dimensional surfaces in the n-dimensional space, which is transformed into a Lebesgue integration over a subset of $\mathbb{R}^m$. In particular, the m-dimensional area of the image of a continuously differentiable mapping u from a domain $E \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ into $\mathbb{R}^n$ is defined as the integral of the Jacobian J_m^u over E. The coarea formula can be viewed as an extension of the Fubini's Theorem to Hausdorff measure, i.e., a double integral can be computed using iterated integrals.

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Note that $J_m^u(\mathbf{x}) \neq 0$ for almost all $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ up to a null set. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right] &= \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right] = \int_\Omega p(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_\Omega \frac{p(\mathbf{x}) f(\mathbf{x})}{J_m^u(\mathbf{x})} J_m^u(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{u\{\Omega\}} \frac{p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))} \mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the area formula in Lemma 1.

Note that by definition, $u\{\Omega\}$ is $(\mathcal{H}^m, m)$ rectifiable because u is a continuously differentiable mapping. If $\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}$ is $(\mathcal{H}^k, k)$ rectifiable, applying the coarea formula in Lemma 2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right] &= \int_{u\{\Omega\}} \frac{p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))} \mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \int_{u\{\Omega\}} \frac{p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y})}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \int_{\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}} \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}) \mathcal{H}^k(d\mathbf{z}), \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where the last equality follows from the coarea formula in Lemma 2.

For $w(\mathbf{z})$ defined in Equation (11), it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right] &= \int_{\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}} w(\mathbf{z}) \int_{\varphi^{-1}(\mathbf{z})} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}) \mathcal{H}^k(d\mathbf{z}) \\ &= \int_{\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}} \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} w(\mathbf{z}) \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y})) J_k^\varphi(\mathbf{y})} \mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}) \mathcal{H}^k(d\mathbf{z}) \\ &= \int_{u\{\Omega\}} w(\varphi(\mathbf{y})) \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))} \mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where the last equality follows from the coarea formula in Lemma 2.

Then by the area formula in Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right] &= \int_{u(\Omega)} w(\varphi(\mathbf{y})) \cdot \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))} \mathcal{H}^m(d\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \int_\Omega w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{x}))\right) f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The rest of proof will be devoted to the second half, i.e., $\mathrm{Var}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)\right] \leq \mathrm{Var}\left[p(\mathbf{X})\right]$. Because these two integrands have the same mean, it suffices to show that

$$\mathrm{E}\left[w^2\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)\right] \leq \mathrm{E}\left[p^2(\mathbf{X})\right].$$

Note that for any given $\mathbf{z} \in \varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
w^2(\mathbf{z}) &= \left[\int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y})\right]^2 \Bigg/ \left[\int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y})\right]^2 \\
&\leq \frac{\int_{\varphi^{-1}\{z\}} \frac{p^2(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}) \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y})}{\left[\int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y})\right]^2} \\
&= \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{p^2(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}) \Bigg/ \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y}),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the inequality follows from Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\left|\int q_1(\mathbf{y})q_2(\mathbf{y})\,d\mathbf{y}\right|^2 \leq \int q_1^2(\mathbf{y})\,d\mathbf{y} \int q_2^2(\mathbf{y})\,d\mathbf{y}$ by letting

$$
q_1(\mathbf{y}) = p(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))\sqrt{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}/\sqrt{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}, \quad q_2(\mathbf{y}) = \sqrt{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}/\sqrt{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}.
$$

Then similar to the arguments in Equations (25) and (26), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\left[w^2\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}))\right)\right] &= \int_{\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}} w^2(\mathbf{z}) \int_{\varphi^{-1}(\mathbf{z})} \frac{f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y})\mathcal{H}^k(d\mathbf{z}) \\
&\leq \int_{\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}} \int_{\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}} \frac{p^2(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))f(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))}{J_m^u(u^{-1}(\mathbf{y}))J_k^{\varphi}(\mathbf{y})}\mathcal{H}^{m-k}(d\mathbf{y})\mathcal{H}^k(d\mathbf{z}) \\
&= \mathrm{E}\left[p^2(\mathbf{X})\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last equality follows from a similar argument as in Equation (24), and the proof is completed. □

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Note that by assumption, $\mathcal{H}^1(\varphi^{-1}\{\mathbf{z}\}) > 0$ for almost all $\mathbf{z}$. Then by the first part of Lemma 2, $\varphi\{u\{\Omega\}\}$ is $(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}, m-1)$ rectifiable.

Applying Theorem 1, we have

$$
\alpha(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)\right].
$$

Because $w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)$ satisfies the Lipschitz continuous condition w.r.t. ξ, by the dominated convergence theorem (Durrett 2005), we interchange the order of differentiation and expectation, leading to

$$
\alpha'(\xi) = \mathrm{E}\left[\partial_\xi w\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[\nu\left(\varphi(u(\mathbf{X}));\xi\right)\right],
$$

which completes the proof. □

B Online Supplement

B.1 Derivation of Estimators for Section 5.1.1

B.1.1 Derivation under the Black-Scholes Model

Under the Black-Scholes (BS) model,

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \exp\left((r - \sigma^2/2)T/m + \sigma\sqrt{T/m}N_{i+1}\right), \quad i = 0, \ldots, m-1,$$

where $\{N_1, \ldots, N_m\}$ are independent standard normal random variables, and the initial underlying asset price $X_0 = x_0$ is a constant.

To simply notation, we let $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^m X_i/m$, $\widehat{X} = \max(X_1, \ldots, X_m)$, $\mu = r - \sigma^2/2$, and $\tau = T/m$. For $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$, the conditional density of X_{i+1} given $X_i = x_i$ is

$$f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}|x_i) = \frac{1}{\sigma x_{i+1}\sqrt{\tau}}\phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{\tau}}\left(\log(x_{i+1}/x_i) - \mu\tau\right)\right), \tag{27}$$

where ϕ denotes the standard normal density function. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_m)$. The joint density of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$ is

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}|x_i).$$

The Change-of-Variables Approach

We apply Proposition 2 to derive change-of-variables estimators, where $h(\mathbf{x})$ shall be specified in the context.

- **The digital option**.

  Note that $dX_m/dx_0 = X_m/x_0$. By Theorem 1 of Liu and Hong (2011),

  $$\texttt{delta} = \frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m \geq K\}}\right] = -\frac{d}{dK}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\frac{dX_m}{dx_0}1_{\{X_m \geq K\}}\right] = \frac{d}{dK}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\frac{X_m}{x_0}1_{\{X_m \leq K\}}\right].$$

  Then setting $h(\mathbf{x}) = x_m$, $g(\mathbf{x}) = e^{-rT}x_m/x_0$, and applying Proposition 2, we have $\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z}, t) = 1/t^{m-1}$, and

  $$\texttt{delta} = \mathrm{E}\left[\nu(\mathbf{Z}; K)\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\frac{X_1 K}{X_m x_0}f_1\left(X_1 K/X_m|x_0\right)\right],$$

  where $\mathbf{Z} \triangleq (Z_1, \ldots, Z_m) = \mathbf{X}/h(\mathbf{X})$, and for $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_m)$,

  $$\begin{aligned}
  \nu(\mathbf{z}; \xi) &= g(\mathbf{z}\xi)f(\mathbf{z}\xi)\xi^{m-1} \Big/ \int_0^\infty f(t\mathbf{z})t^{m-1}dt \\
  &= e^{-rT}z_m\xi/x_0 f_1(z_1\xi) \Big/ \int_0^\infty f_1(z_1 t)\, dt \\
  &= \frac{e^{-rT}z_m z_1 \xi}{x_0}f_1(z_1\xi) = \frac{e^{-rT}z_1\xi}{x_0}f_1(z_1\xi),
  \end{aligned}$$

  where the last equality follows from $z_m = 1$.

In a similar manner, it can be derived that

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\frac{X_1K}{X_m}f_1\left(X_1K/X_m|x_0\right)\left(\mu T+\log(K/x_0)\right)/(2T)\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\frac{X_1K}{X_m}f_1\left(X_1K/X_m|x_0\right)\left(\log(K/x_0)-(\mu+\sigma^2)T\right)/\sigma\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \frac{d\texttt{delta}}{dx_0} = \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1K}{x_0^2\sigma^2\tau X_m}f_1\left(X_1K/X_m|x_0\right)\left(\log(X_1K/x_0X_m)-(\mu+\sigma^2)\tau\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

where f_1 is the conditional density of X_1 given x_0 as specified in (27).

- **The Asian digital option**.

  The derivation is parallel to that for the digital option, except that $h(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^m x_m/m$, and $\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) = \sqrt{m}/t^{m-1}$. Applying Proposition 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1K}{\bar{X}}f_1\left(X_1K/\bar{X}|x_0\right)\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1K}{2mT\bar{X}}f_1\left(X_1K/\bar{X}|x_0\right)\sum_{i=1}^m\frac{X_i}{\bar{X}}\left(\log\frac{X_iK}{x_0\bar{X}}-\mu_b i\tau\right)\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1K}{m\sigma\bar{X}}f_1\left(X_1K/\bar{X}|x_0\right)\sum_{i=1}^m\frac{X_i}{\bar{X}}\left(\log\frac{X_iK}{x_0\bar{X}}-(\mu+\sigma^2)i\tau\right)\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1K}{x_0^2\sigma^2\tau\bar{X}}f_1\left(X_1K/\bar{X}|x_0\right)\left(\log\frac{X_1K}{x_0\bar{X}}-(\mu+\sigma^2)\tau\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The barrier call option**.

  Note that $dX_i/dx_0 = X_i/x_0$ for $i = 1,\ldots,m$. By Theorem 1 of Liu and Hong (2011),

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] \\
&= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\frac{X_m}{x_0}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] - \frac{d}{d\kappa}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+\frac{\widehat{X}}{x_0}1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

  Similar to the derivation for the digital option, we apply Proposition 2 to derive change-of-variables estimator for the second term on the right-hand-side of the above equation. In particular, we set $h(\mathbf{x}) = \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \triangleq \max(x_1,\ldots,x_m)$, and $i^* = \mathrm{argmax}(X_1,\ldots,X_m)$. Then the Jacobian $\bar{J}_m(\mathbf{z},t) = 1/t^{m-1}$, and Proposition 2 leads to

$$\frac{d}{d\kappa}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+\frac{\widehat{X}}{x_0}1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}\kappa X_1}{x_0\widehat{X}}f_1\left(X_1\kappa/\widehat{X}|x_0\right)\left(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K\right)^+\right],$$

  and thus

$$\texttt{delta} = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\frac{X_m}{x_0}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}} - \frac{e^{-rT}\kappa X_1}{x_0\widehat{X}}f_1\left(X_1\kappa/\widehat{X}|x_0\right)\left(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K\right)^+\right].$$

Similarly it can be derived that

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\le\kappa\}}\right]-\frac{e^{-rT}}{2T}\mathrm{E}\left[X_m1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}1_{\{\widehat{X}\le\kappa\}}(\log(X_m/x_0)+\mu T)\right]\\
&\quad+\frac{e^{-rT}}{2T}\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{X_1\kappa}{\widehat{X}}f_1\left(X_1\kappa/\widehat{X}|x_0\right)\left(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K\right)^+\left(\log(\kappa/x_0)+\mu i^*\tau\right)\right],\\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}X_m1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}1_{\{\widehat{X}\le\kappa\}}\left(\log(X_m/x_0)-(\mu+\sigma^2)T\right)/\sigma\right]\\
&\quad-\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1\kappa}{\sigma\widehat{X}}f_1\left(X_1\kappa/\widehat{X}|x_0\right)\left(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K\right)^+\left(\log(\kappa/x_0)-(\mu+\sigma^2)i^*\tau\right)\right],\\
\texttt{gamma} &= E\left[\frac{e^{-rT}K^2X_1f_1(X_1K/X_m|x_0)}{X_mx_0^2}1_{\{\widehat{X}K/X_m\le\kappa\}}\right]\\
&\quad-\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1X_m\kappa^2}{x_0^2\widehat{X}^2}f_1(X_1\kappa/\widehat{X}|x_0)1_{\{X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}\ge K\}}\right]\\
&\quad-\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_1\kappa}{\widehat{X}x_0^2\sigma^2\tau}f_1(X_1\kappa/\widehat{X})(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K)^+\left(\log\frac{X_1\kappa}{x_0\widehat{X}}-(\mu+\sigma^2)\tau\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

The Likelihood Ratio Approach

Note that the likelihood ratios with respect to S_0, σ and T are

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{d}{dx_0}\log f(\mathbf{x})=\frac{1}{x_0\sigma^2\tau}\left(\log\frac{x_1}{x_0}-\mu\tau\right),\\
L_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x})}\frac{d^2}{dx_0^2}f(\mathbf{x})=L_1^2(\mathbf{x})-\frac{1}{x_0^2\sigma^2\tau}\left(\log\frac{x_1}{x_0}-\mu\tau+1\right),\\
L_3(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{d}{dT}\log f(\mathbf{x})=\frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=0}^{m-1}\left[\frac{1}{2\sigma^2\tau^2}\left(\log\frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}-\mu\tau\right)^2+\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2\tau}\left(\log\frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}-\mu\tau\right)-\frac{1}{2\tau}\right],\\
L_4(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{d}{d\sigma}\log f(\mathbf{x})=\sum_{i=0}^{m-1}\left[\frac{1}{\sigma^3\tau}\left(\log\frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}-\mu\tau\right)^2-\frac{1}{\sigma}\left(\log\frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}-\mu\tau\right)-\frac{1}{\sigma}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The digital option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_1(\mathbf{X})1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right],\\
\texttt{theta} &= -\frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right]-\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_3(\mathbf{X})1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right],\\
\texttt{vega} &= \frac{d}{d\sigma}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_4(\mathbf{X})1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right],\\
\texttt{gamma} &= \frac{d^2}{dx_0^2}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_2(\mathbf{X})1_{\{X_m\ge K\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The Asian digital option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_1(\mathbf{X})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= -\frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_3(\mathbf{X})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \frac{d}{d\sigma}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_4(\mathbf{X})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \frac{d^2}{dx_0^2}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_2(\mathbf{X})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The barrier call option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_1(\mathbf{X})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= -\frac{d}{dx_0}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] \\
&= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_3(\mathbf{X})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \frac{d}{d\sigma}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_4(\mathbf{X})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \frac{d^2}{dx_0^2}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_2(\mathbf{X})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Conventional Conditional Monte Carlo Approach

- **The digital option**.

  Conditioning on X_{m-1} yields

$$\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}|X_{m-1}\right]\right) = \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\left(1-\Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{\tau}}\left(\log\frac{K}{X_{m-1}}-\mu\tau\right)\right)\right)\right],$$

  where Φ denotes the standard normal distribution function.

  Using the pathwise method on the right-hand-side (RHS) of the above equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}Kf_m(K|X_{m-1})}{x_0}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right] - \frac{1}{2T}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}Kf_m(K|X_{m-1})\left(\log(K/x_0)+\mu T\right)\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}Kf_m(K|X_{m-1})\left(\log(K/x_0)-(\mu+\sigma^2)T\right)}{\sigma}\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}Kf_m(K|X_{m-1})(\log(K/X_{m-1})-(\mu+\sigma^2)\tau)}{x_0^2\sigma^2\tau}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The Asian digital option**.

Let $S_{-m} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i$ and $S_m = mK - S_{-m}$. Conditioning on $\{X_1, \ldots, X_{m-1}\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT} 1_{\{\bar{X} \geq K\}}\right] &= \mathrm{E}\left[\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT} 1_{\{\bar{X} \geq K\}} | X_1, \ldots, X_{m-1}\right]\right] \\
&= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{\tau}}\left(\log\frac{mK - S_{-m}}{X_{m-1}} - \mu\tau\right)\right)\right) 1_{\{S_{-m} \leq mK\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Using the pathwise method on the RHS of the above equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT} mK f_m(S_m|X_{m-1})}{x_0} 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT} 1_{\{\bar{X} \geq K\}}\right] - \frac{1}{2T}\mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT} f_m(S_m|X_{m-1}) 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}}\right. \\
&\qquad \left. S_m(\log(S_m/x_0) + \mu T) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i(\log(X_i/x_0) + i\mu\tau)\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT} f_m(S_m|X_{m-1})}{\sigma} 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}}\right. \\
&\qquad \left.\left(S_m(\log(S_m/x_0) - (\mu + \sigma^2)T) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i(\log(X_i/x_0) - i(\mu + \sigma^2)\tau)\right)\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT} mK f_m(S_m|X_{m-1})}{S_m x_0^2} 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}}\left(S_{-m} - S_m + \frac{mK(\log(S_m/X_{m-1}) - \mu\tau)}{\sigma^2\tau}\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

B.1.2 Derivation under the Variance Gamma Model

Under the variance gamma (VG) model,

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \exp(\mu_\beta \tau + \theta G_{i+1} + \sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}} N_{i+1}), \quad i = 0, \ldots, m-1,$$

where $\tau = T/m$, $\{G_1, \ldots, G_m\}$ are independent gamma random variables with scale parameter τ/β and shape parameter β, $\{N_1, \ldots, N_m\}$ are independent standard normal random variables, and $\mu_\beta = r + 1/\beta \log(1 - \theta\beta - \sigma^2\beta/2)$.

Note that for $i = 0, \ldots, m-1$, the conditional density of X_{i+1} given G_{i+1} and $X_i = x_i$ is

$$f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}|x_i, G_{i+1}) = \frac{1}{x_{i+1}\sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}}}\phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}}}\left(\log\left(\frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}\right) - \mu_\beta\tau - \theta G_{i+1}\right)\right),$$

and thus the conditional density of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$ given $\mathbf{G} = (G_1, \ldots, G_m)$ is

$$f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} f_{i+1}(x_{i+1}|x_i, G_{i+1}) = \prod_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{x_{i+1}\sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}}}\phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{G_{i+1}}}\left(\log\left(\frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}\right) - \mu_\beta\tau - \theta G_{i+1}\right)\right),$$

where ϕ denotes the standard normal density function.

The Change-of-Variables Approach

The derivation of the change-of-variables estimators is similar to that under the Black-Scholes model, except that we are working with the conditional density of $\mathbf{X}$ given $\mathbf{G}$, instead of the

unconditional density. Specifically, for a parameter η that $\mathbf{X}$ may depend on and a function $l(\cdot)$, it holds that

$$\frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})\right] = \frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{G}\right]\right) = \mathrm{E}\left(\frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{G}\right]\right), \tag{28}$$

provided that $\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{G}\right]$ is a smooth function of $\mathbf{G}$. For estimating price sensitivities under the VG model, it can be verified that $\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{G}\right]$ is indeed smooth for the function l of concern, and therefore (28) is justified. Then, Proposition 2 can be applied to $d\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{G}\right]/d\eta$, leading to

$$\frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{G}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left[\psi(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{G})|\mathbf{G}\right], \tag{29}$$

for an appropriate function ψ, and thus combining with (28) yields

$$\frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})\right] = \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{E}\left[\psi(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{G})|\mathbf{G}\right]\right) = \mathrm{E}\left[\psi(\mathbf{X},\mathbf{G})\right].$$

Note that conditional on $\mathbf{G}$, the VG model has the same structure as the BS model. Therefore, under the VG model, the way of applying Proposition 2 to derive ψ in (29) for various options is exactly parallel to that under the BS model in Section B.1.1. The details are thus omitted.

To further simplify notations, we let $S_G = \sum_{i=1}^m G_i$, $\gamma = 1 - \theta\beta - \sigma^2\beta/2$, and

$$\phi_{1,d} = f_1\left(\frac{X_1K}{X_m}\middle| x_0, G_1\right), \quad \phi_{1,a} = f_1\left(\frac{X_1K}{\bar{X}}\middle| x_0, G_1\right), \quad \phi_{1,b} = f_1\left(\frac{X_1\kappa}{\widehat{X}}\middle| x_0, G_1\right).$$

- **The digital option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1}{x_0X_m}\phi_{1,d}\right],\\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1\phi_{1,d}}{2TX_m}\left(\theta S_G + \mu_\beta T + \log\frac{K}{x_0}\right)\right],\\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1\phi_{1,d}}{X_m}\left(\frac{\log(K/x_0) - \mu_\beta T - \theta S_G}{\sigma} - \frac{T\sigma}{\gamma}\right)\right],\\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1\phi_{1,d}}{X_mx_0^2\sigma^2G_1}\left(\log\frac{KX_1}{x_0X_m} - (\mu_\beta\tau + \theta G_1 + \sigma^2G_1)\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The Asian digital option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1}{x_0\bar{X}}\phi_{1,a}\right],\\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1\phi_{1,a}}{2mT\bar{X}}\sum_{i=1}^m\left(\log\frac{KX_i}{x_0\bar{X}} + i\mu_\beta\tau + \frac{X_i}{\bar{X}}\sum_{k=1}^i G_k\theta\right)\right],\\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1}{m\bar{X}}\phi_{1,a}\sum_{i=1}^m\frac{X_i}{\bar{X}}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma}\left(\log\frac{KX_i}{x_0\bar{X}} - i\mu_\beta\tau - \theta S_G\right) - \frac{i\sigma\tau}{\gamma}\right)\right],\\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}KX_1}{\bar{X}x_0^2\sigma^2G_1}\phi_{1,a}\left(\log\frac{KX_1}{x_0\bar{X}} - (\mu_\beta\tau + \theta G_1 + \sigma^2G_1)\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The barrier call option**. Let $i^* = \text{argmax}\{X_1, \ldots, X_m\}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_m}{x_0}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}\kappa X_1\phi_{1,m}}{x_0\widehat{X}}(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K)^+\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}X_m}{2T}\left(\log\frac{X_m}{x_0}+\mu_\beta T+\theta S_G\right)1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] \\
&\quad +\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}\kappa X_1\phi_{1,b}}{2T\widehat{X}}(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K)^+\left(\log\frac{\kappa}{x_0}+\mu_\beta i^*\tau+\theta\sum_{j=1}^{i^*}G_j\right)\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}X_m\left(\frac{\log(X_m/x_0)-\mu_\beta T-\theta S_G}{\sigma}-\frac{\sigma T}{\gamma}\right)1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] \\
&\quad -\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}\kappa X_1\phi_{1,m}}{\widehat{X}}(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K)^+\left(\frac{\log(\kappa/x_0)-\mu_\beta i^*\tau-\theta\sum_{j=1}^{i^*}G_j}{\sigma}-\frac{\sigma i^*\tau}{\gamma}\right)\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}K^2X_1\phi_{1,d}}{x_0^2X_m}1_{\{K\widehat{X}/X_m\leq\kappa\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}\kappa^2X_1X_m\phi_{1,b}}{x_0^2\widehat{X}^2}1_{\{\kappa X_m/\widehat{X}\geq K\}}\right] \\
&\quad -\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}\kappa X_1\phi_{1,b}}{\widehat{X}x_0^2\sigma^2G_1}(X_m\kappa/\widehat{X}-K)^+\left(\log\frac{\kappa X_1}{x_0\widehat{X}}-(\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_1+\sigma^2G_1)\right)\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

The Likelihood Ratio Approach

For any function l, and a market parameter η, note that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})\right] = \frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})|\mathbf{G}\right]\right) \\
&= \frac{d}{d\eta}\mathrm{E}\left[\int l(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G})\,d\mathbf{x}\right] = \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})\frac{d\log f(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})}{d\eta}|\mathbf{G}\right]\right) = \mathrm{E}\left[l(\mathbf{X})\frac{d\log f(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})}{d\eta}\right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where the interchange of expectation and differentiation in the third equality is usually valid, because the integration $\int l(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G})\,d\mathbf{x}$ is usually continuous in η even when l is discontinuous.

By elementary algebra, the conditional likelihood ratios with respect to S_0, σ and T are

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_1(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) &= \frac{d}{dx_0}\log f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) = \frac{1}{x_0\sigma^2G_0}\left(\log\frac{x_1}{x_0}-(\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_1)\right), \\
L_2(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) &= \frac{1}{f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G})}\frac{d^2}{dx_0^2}f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) = L_1^2(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) - \frac{1}{x_0^2\sigma^2G_1}\left(\log\frac{x_1}{x_0}-(\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_1)+1\right), \\
L_3(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) &= \frac{d}{dT}\log f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) \\
&= -\frac{m}{2T}+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{\left(\log\frac{x_i}{x_{i-1}}-(\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_i)\right)^2}{2\sigma^2TG_i}+\frac{\left(\log\frac{x_i}{x_{i-1}}-(\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_i)\right)\left(\frac{\mu_\beta}{m}+\frac{\theta G_i}{T}\right)}{x_0^2\sigma^2G_1}, \\
L_4(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) &= \frac{d}{d\sigma}\log f(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{G}) = -\frac{m}{\sigma}+\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{\left(\log\frac{x_i}{x_{i-1}}-(\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_i)\right)^2}{\sigma^3G_i}-\frac{\left(\log\frac{x_i}{x_{i-1}}-(\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_i)\right)\tau}{\sigma G_i(1-\theta\beta-\sigma^2\beta/2)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

- **The digital option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_1(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_3(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_4(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_2(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The Asian digital option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_1(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_3(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_4(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_2(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})1_{\{\bar{X}\geq K\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The barrier call option**.

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_1(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_3(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_4(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}L_2(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{G})(X_m-K)^+1_{\{\widehat{X}\leq\kappa\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Conventional Conditional Monte Carlo Approach

Define $\phi_m = f_m\left(K \middle| X_{m-1}, G_m\right)$ in the following context.

- **The digital option**.

  Conditioning on $\mathbf{G}$ and X_{m-1} and then applying the pathwise method lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}K\phi_m}{x_0}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT}1_{\{X_m\geq K\}}\right] \\
&\quad -\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}\left(\theta\sum_{i=1}^m G_i + \mu_\beta T + \log(K/x_0)\right)K\phi_m}{2T}\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}K\phi_m\left(\frac{\log(K/x_0)-\mu_\beta T-\theta\sum_{i=1}^m G_i}{\sigma} - \frac{T\sigma}{1-\theta\beta-\sigma^2\beta/2}\right)\right] \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT}K\phi_m\left(\log\frac{K}{X_{m-1}} - (\mu_\beta\tau+\theta G_m+\sigma^2 G_m)\right)}{x_0^2\sigma^2 G_m}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

- **The Asian digital option**.

  Let $S_{-m} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i$, $S_m = mK - S_{-m}$, and $S_G = \sum_{i=1}^{m} G_i$. To further simplify notation, we let $\gamma = 1 - \theta\beta - \sigma^2\beta/2$, and

$$\widehat{\phi}_m = f_m(S_m | X_{m-1}, G_m).$$

  Conditioning on $\mathbf{G}$ and $(X_1, \ldots, X_{m-1})$ and then applying the pathwise method lead to

$$\begin{aligned}
\texttt{delta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT} mK \widehat{\phi}_m}{x_0} 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}}\right], \\
\texttt{theta} &= \mathrm{E}\left[re^{-rT} 1_{\{\bar{X} \geq K\}}\right] - \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\widehat{\phi}_m 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}}\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left(S_m \frac{\log(S_m/x_0) + \mu_\beta T + \theta S_G}{2T} + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i \left(\log\frac{X_i}{x_0} + i\mu_\beta\tau + \theta\sum_{k=1}^{i} G_k\right)\right)\right], \\
\texttt{vega} &= \mathrm{E}\left[e^{-rT}\widehat{\phi}_m 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}}\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left(S_m\left(\frac{\log\frac{S_m}{x_0} - \mu_\beta T - \theta S_G}{\sigma} - \frac{T\sigma}{\gamma}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} X_i \left(\frac{\log\frac{X_i}{x_0} - i\mu_\beta\tau - \theta\sum_{j=1}^{i} G_j}{\sigma} - \frac{i\sigma\tau}{\gamma}\right)\right)\right], \\
\texttt{gamma} &= \mathrm{E}\left[\frac{e^{-rT} mK \widehat{\phi}_m}{x_0^2} 1_{\{S_{-m} < mK\}} \left(-1 + \frac{S_{-m}}{S_m} + \frac{mK\left(\log\frac{S_m}{X_{m-1}} - (\mu_\beta\tau + \theta G_m)\right)}{\sigma^2 G_m S_m}\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

B.2 Gradient Estimators for the Chance Constrained Program Example

B.2.1 Multivariate Normal Distribution

Suppose that $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$ follows a multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and a covariance matrix Σ. Its density function is

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{m/2}} |\Sigma|^{-1/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{x}}.$$

We first derive a conventional CMC estimator. Let Σ_1 denote the covariance matrix of $(X_1, t_2X_2 + \ldots + t_mX_m)$, and set $A \triangleq (a_{ij})_{1\leq i\leq 2, 1\leq j\leq 2} = \Sigma_1^{-1}$. Conditioning on $(X_2, \ldots, X_m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\right) \\
&\quad = \mathrm{E}\left[\Phi\left(\sqrt{a_{11}}\left(\frac{b - \sum_{i=2}^{m} t_i X_i}{t_1} + \frac{a_{12}}{a_{11}}\sum_{k=2}^{m} t_k X_k\right)\right)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where Φ denotes the standard normal distribution function. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{t_1} \Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \leq b\right) \\
&\quad = -\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\sqrt{a_{11}}(b - \sum_{i=2}^{m} t_i X_i)}{t_1^2}\phi\left(\sqrt{a_{11}}\left(\frac{b - \sum_{i=2}^{m} t_i X_i}{t_1} + \frac{a_{12}}{a_{11}}\sum_{k=2}^{m} t_k X_k\right)\right)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where ϕ denotes the standard normal density function.

Next we consider the change-of-variables estimator by (21). Define $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X}/(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X})$. By (21),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{t_1} \Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \le b\right) \\
&= -\mathrm{E}\left[b|b|^{m-1} Z_1 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}b^2} \Big/ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |y|^{m-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}y^2}\, dy \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |y|^{m-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}y^2}\, dy &= 2\int_0^{\infty} y^{m-1} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}y^2}\, dy \\
&= (2\pi)^{-m/2}|\Sigma|^{-1/2}\left(\frac{2}{\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}}\right)^{m/2}\int_0^{\infty} e^{-u}u^{m/2-1}\, du \\
&= (2\pi)^{-m/2}|\Sigma|^{-1/2}\left(\frac{2}{\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}}\right)^{m/2}\Gamma(m/2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second to last equality follows from a change of variables $u = \mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}y^2/2$, and the gamma function is defined by $\Gamma(t) = \int_0^{\infty} y^{t-1}e^{-y}\, dy$.

Therefore,

$$\partial_{t_1} \Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \le b\right) = -\frac{b|b|^{m-1}}{\Gamma(m/2)2^{m/2}}\mathrm{E}\left[Z_1 \left(\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\right)^{m/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}b^2}\right]$$

B.2.2 Multivariate Student's t-Distribution

Suppose that $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \ldots, X_m)$ follows a multivariate Student's t-distribution with mean zero, a covariance matrix Σ, and v degrees of freedom. Its density function is

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{C}{(1 + \mathbf{x}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{x}/v)^{(v+m)/2}},$$

where

$$C = \frac{\Gamma((v+m)/2)}{\Gamma(v/2)v^{m/2}\pi^{m/2}|\Sigma|^{1/2}}.$$

Equivalently, one may generate a multivariate normal distribution $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_m)$ with mean zero and covariance Σ and a chi square random variable χ_v^2 with v degrees of freedoms, and set $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{Y}\sqrt{v/\chi_v^2}$.

We first derive a conventional CMC estimator. Let Σ_1 denote the covariance matrix of $(Y_1, t_2Y_2 + \ldots + t_mY_m)$, and set $A \triangleq (a_{ij})_{1\le i\le 2, 1\le j\le 2} = \Sigma_1^{-1}$. Conditioning on $(Y_2, \ldots, Y_m)$ and χ_v^2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \le b\right) = \Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{Y} \le b/\sqrt{v/\chi_v^2}\right) \\
&= \mathrm{E}\left[\Phi\left(\sqrt{a_{11}}\left(\frac{b/\sqrt{v/\chi_v^2} - \sum_{i=2}^m t_iY_i}{t_1} + \frac{a_{12}}{a_{11}}\sum_{k=2}^m t_kY_k\right)\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{t_1} \Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \le b\right) \\
&= -\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{\sqrt{a_{11}}(b/\sqrt{v/\chi_v^2} - \sum_{i=2}^m t_i Y_i)}{t_1^2}\phi\left(\sqrt{a_{11}}\left(\frac{b/\sqrt{v/\chi_v^2} - \sum_{i=2}^m t_i Y_i}{t_1} + \frac{a_{12}}{a_{11}}\sum_{k=2}^m t_k Y_k\right)\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Next we consider the new CMC estimator by (21). Define $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X}/(t^T\mathbf{X})$. By (21),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{t_1} \Pr\left(t^T\mathbf{X} \le b\right) \\
&= -\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{b|b|^{m-1}Z_1}{\left(1 + \mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}b^2/v\right)^{(v+m)/2}} \Big/ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|y|^{m-1}}{\left(1 + \mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}y^2/v\right)^{(v+m)/2}}\, dy\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|y|^{m-1}}{\left(1 + \mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}y^2/v\right)^{(v+m)/2}}\, dy &= 2\int_0^{\infty} \frac{y^{m-1}}{\left(1 + \mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}y^2/v\right)^{(v+m)/2}}\, dy \\
&= \frac{v^{m/2}}{(v+m-1)^{m/2}\left(\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\right)^{m/2}} 2\int_0^{\infty} \frac{w^{m-1}}{\left(1 + w^2/(v+m-1)\right)^{(v+m)/2}}\, dw \\
&= \frac{v^{m/2}}{(v+m-1)^{m/2}\left(\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\right)^{m/2}} \frac{C_1\Gamma(m/2)\Gamma(v/2)(v+m-1)^{(m-1)/2}}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma((v+m-1)/2)} \\
&= \frac{v^{m/2}\Gamma(m/2)\Gamma(v/2)}{\Gamma((v+m)/2)\left(\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\right)^{m/2}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = \Gamma((v+m)/2) \Big/ \left[\sqrt{(v+m-1)\pi}\Gamma((v+m-1)/2)\right]$, and the second to last equality follows from the closed form formula of the raw moment for t-distribution.

Therefore,

$$\partial_{t_1} \Pr\left(\mathbf{t}^T\mathbf{X} \le b\right) = -\mathrm{E}\left[\frac{b|b|^{m-1}Z_1\Gamma((v+m)/2)\left(\mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}\right)^{m/2}}{\left(1 + \mathbf{Z}^T\Sigma^{-1}\mathbf{Z}b^2/v\right)^{(v+m)/2} v^{m/2}\Gamma(m/2)\Gamma(v/2)}\right].$$